Kansas City Public Library

Teachers' Library

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THE ROOM

370.6 N277y 1927 v.2 c.3

Kansas City
Public Library



This Volume is for

REFERENCE USE ONLY

11-26—6m—1'

THE TWENTY-SIXTH YEARBOOK

OF THE

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

THE FOUNDATIONS AND TECHNIQUE OF CURRICULUM-CONSTRUCTION

Prepared by the Society's Committee Under the Direction of
HAROLD RUGG

Edited by
GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE

PART II
THE FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM-MAKING

By William C. Bagley, Franklin Bobbitt, Frederick G. Bonser, Werrett W. Charters, George S. Counts, Stuart A. Courtis, Ernest Horn, Charles H. Judd, Frederick J. Kelly, William H. Kilpatrick, Harold Rugg (*Chairman*), George A. Works

THIS YEARBOOK WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE DALLAS MEETING OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, AND TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1927, 8:00 P.M.

PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS
1926

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

for 1926-7

Board of Directors

(Term of office expires March 1st of the year indicated)

B. R. Buckingham (1929)
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Werrett W. Charters (1928)
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Stuart A. Courtis (1927)
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Charles H. Judd (1928)
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Leonard V. Koos, *Chairman* (1927)
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Harold Rugg (1929)
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Guy Montrose Whipple (*Ex-Officio*)
Danvers, Massachusetts

Secretary-Treasurer

Guy Montrose Whipple (1929)
Danvers, Massachusetts

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SOCIETY'S COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM-MAKING

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

FRANKLIN BOBBITT, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

FREDERICK G. BONSER, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

WERRETT W. CHARTERS, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

GEORGE S. COUNTS, Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

STUART A. COURTIS, Professor of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

ERNEST HORN, Professor of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

CHARLES H. JUDD, Director of the School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

FREDERICK J. KELLY, Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

HAROLD RUGG (*Chairman*), The Lincoln School of Teachers College, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

GEORGE A. WORKS, Professor of Education, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	EDITOR'S PREFACE	VI
	FOREWORD	VII
	INTRODUCTION (Chairman of the Society's Committee)	1
	LIST OF FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS ON CURRICULUM-MAKING	9
CHAPTER		
I	THE FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM-MAKING By the Members of the Society's Committee on Curriculum-Making	11
II	SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT W. C. Bagley, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City	29
III	THE ORIENTATION OF THE CURRICULUM-MAKER Franklin Bobbitt, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	41
IV	THE CURRICULUM AND CURRICULUM-MAKING Frederick G. Bonser, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University	57
V	STATEMENT Werrett W. Charters, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	71
VI	SOME NOTES ON THE FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM-MAKING George S. Counts, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	73
VII	READING BETWEEN THE LINES Stuart A. Courtis, Professor of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan	91
VIII	DISCUSSION OF THE GENERAL STATEMENT Ernest Horn, Professor of Education, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa	99
IX	SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT Charles H. Judd, Director of the School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.	113
X	STATEMENT OF POSITION William H. Kilpatrick, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City	119
XI	CURRICULUM-MAKING: POINTS OF EMPHASIS Harold Rugg, Teachers College, Columbia University	147
XII	REPRESENTATIVE QUOTATIONS FROM JOHN DEWEY'S WRITTEN STATEMENTS ON THE CURRICULUM (1900-1926)	165
XIII	REPRESENTATIVE QUOTATIONS FROM THE WRITTEN STATEMENTS ON THE CURRICULUM BY THE HERBARTIANS AND THEIR CRITICS (1894-1896)	189
	CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION	211
	MINUTES OF THE WASHINGTON MEETING OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 20 AND 23, 1926	215
	LIST OF HONORARY AND ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION	219
	INFORMATION CONCERNING THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION	237

EDITOR'S PREFACE

This Yearbook is in several respects among the most ambitious undertakings of the Society. The idea of attacking the problem of the curriculum in a fundamental way—not trying to determine what the content of the curriculum should be, but trying to determine how that content should be selected and assembled—was broached by Dr. Harold Rugg, the chairman of the Society's Committee responsible for this Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, more than two years ago; indeed, the original intent had been to finish the Yearbook in the fall of 1924. The proposal met with ready reception in view of the current widespread interest in the problem of the curriculum. It was felt that the National Society for the Study of Education could perform a real service to the movement for curriculum-revision by directing its contribution to this preliminary problem of method, and particularly by making a special effort to bring together, and so far as possible to unify or to reconcile, the varying and often seemingly divergent or even antagonistic philosophies of the curriculum that were being espoused by leading authorities or by their adherents in this country.

This ambition could be realized only by means of numerous conferences for the free interchange of views. Accordingly, the Directors voted this Committee the (for us) unusually large appropriation of $2,500. It is hoped that this subsidizing of the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook will be amply justified in the minds of the Society's members when they scan the pages that follow, especially the formulation, in Part II, of the General Statement of Principles acceptable to the entire Committee and the frank and interesting individual statements that follow in exposition of the views of the several members of the Committee.

It is also hoped that the members of the Society will approve the plan, on trial this year, of issuing the yearbook in the fall preceding the February meeting at which it is to be discussed.

G. M. W.

FOREWORD

The chief purpose of this Yearbook is the inventory and appraisal of curriculum-making in American schools — past and present. From time to time, in a dynamic society it is imperative that we stand aside from the movement of affairs to review trends, to assay products, to map out new paths. The chief outcome is reorientation, a balanced perspective; especially is this needed in these days of vigorous experimentation. It is most important that those who are constructing our school curriculum shall maintain an overview of the total situation; lacking that, their orientation will be biased, their emphases misplaced. There is grave danger that they will continue to commit themselves uncritically to plans and movements — to take up the current modes only to discard them as unthinkingly as they adopted them. Much of the machinery of American education has indeed developed in the past fifty years by just this method.

Synthesis is needed especially because of the gap between school and society, and between curriculum and child growth. Life on the American continent has moved in two parallel but rarely merging currents. One has been the dynamic rush of land settlement, industry, and politics—exploitive, mercenary, unmeditative. The other — the academic stream of letters, art, and education — has lagged sluggishly behind. The first is thoroughly indigenous and has dominated American life for three centuries; the second, imitative, looking toward Europe and the past, has been unconsciously determined by it, although never in touch with it. No problem confronting the school is more insistent or more difficult than the rechanneling into one broad stream of these isolated currents of practical and cultural life.

To bring this about, the curriculum must be fashioned out of the very materials of child activity and of American life. Curriculum-making must become comprehensive, all-embracing, and continuous, not partial and intermittent, as it has been during a century of national development. The chapters of this volume show that no group responsible for the organization of the materials of instruction has really viewed the whole problem. The chief cause lies in the orientation, personnel, and procedures of those who have directed it.

In fifty years of curriculum-making the greatest need has been for a comprehensive overview of the currents of American life and education, appraisal of all the factors in the educational situation. Rarely — and then only by fast striding pioneers — have the child, American civilization, and the school been considered together.

Each of the three outstanding forces engaging in the organization of the curriculum during the past thirty-five years certainly has lacked a complete overview. Each was biased toward academic formulae, child interests, or the scientific study of society. The successive national committees, for example, have viewed the school from the starting point of fixed boundaries of subject matter and have been thoroughly committed to doctrines of scholarship and discipline. The protagonists of the philosophy of dynamic growth were also limited in their attack, although much closer to the truth than the subject-matter specialists. They focussed their attention so sharply upon the child that they tended to ignore the real end points of growth in our current complex order. Similarly, the newest group of curriculum reformers, students of the more scientific study of education, have been somewhat unduly immersed in their techniques. Hence, they, too, have moved on a tangent, emphasizing the study of social needs and tending to minimize child growth.

No agency in American life, therefore, has been sufficiently concerned with the *total* situation. Although the task is difficult, there is great need for a new synthesis, a comprehensive orientation of the relation between the school curriculum and the content of life on the American continent to-day. With three systematic movements for curriculum-making well under way and with an accumulating capital of experience to build upon, it is now possible to evaluate the current needs and to obtain a new vision of the direction in which the educational machine should be guided.

Now, the scope of American life is staggering. Its content is almost hopelessly complicated. The American scene is a welter of interrelated forces, institutions, ideals, cultures, prejudices, conventions, protests, what not. The school curriculum is the only great organized agency which can muster sufficient potential to prepare the younger generation to understand it.

Because of the complexity of American life, it has become increasingly clear that a sound orientation will be produced only by

the coöperative endeavor of many minds. The tasks of curriculum-making are manifold, highly technical, and they demand special professional training and experience.

An ideal conference on the reconstruction of the school, therefore, would assemble a great variety of interests and experience; far wider, indeed, than we have been able to bring together. The group would comprise, in addition to technically trained students of education, disinterested students of contemporary civilization — analysts aloof from the academic formulae of education — the poet, the novelist, the dramatist, the architect, critics of economic, political, and cultural life, students of the development of society, specialists in contemporary industry, business, government, population, community, and international affairs. These would coöperate with students of the scientific study of child capacities, methods of learning, educational experimentation and measurement, school administration, and the documentation of materials. Such a range in personnel would produce, of course, a confusion of vocabularies and would necessitate a more prolonged exchange of views than it is feasible to provide for in the present instance. Lacking the resources to organize the wider company, these two volumes have been prepared, therefore, by a group representing a partial range of specialized equipments, but a pronounced interest in the *general public school situation*. The members of the committee are all professional students of the curriculum and have sought constantly to maintain a broad perspective of American life and of growing childhood.

Recognizing clearly, therefore, the difficulties in the way of a total analysis of the current educational situation, they have joined hands, nevertheless, in the endeavor to compass it. For two years they have been engaged in the development of one phase or another of the work, either in collecting and appraising the contemporary situation, in studying the chief trends of development in the past century or in prolonged round-table conferences over similarities and divergences in educational theory.

This Yearbook presents three results of their efforts: a historical review, a description and evaluation of contemporary practices, and a statement of foundational principles for curriculum reconstruction. There appears first, in Part I, therefore, an outline of the major movements of curriculum-making, the chief

trends, the crucial forces operative in a century of development. Our historical study, although attempting to lay a foundation in earlier movements, concentrates naturally upon the movements of the past forty years. It is out of an understanding of the achievements and deficiencies of recent movements that we shall secure the greatest help in redirecting our current efforts; so this more recent historical study attempts to set in relation the work done by three groups: (1) the national committees composed of 'subject-matter' specialists — mathematicians, scientists, philologists, etc.; (2) experimenters in the laboratory schools; (3) the students of the more 'scientific' study of education. This material is presented in Section I of Part I.

Second, a description and evaluation of current methods of curriculum-construction is presented in Part I. Again, the need is for a synthesis of undertakings. In Section II, Mr. Courtis and Mr. Counts describe current methods of curriculum-construction in town and city systems. Mr. Works does the same thing for the state systems. Recent developments in a few conspicuous school systems have produced additions to the administrative techniques of curriculum-making. In Section III, therefore, examples of progressive curriculum-construction in six public school systems are given. The laboratory schools, furthermore (at least a dozen of which stand out for their trial of new materials and methods), are also brought into our review. The techniques and philosophies underlying curriculum-making in ten of these laboratory schools are set forth in Section IV. Appraisal is needed—critical evaluation—hence the chapter by Mr. Bonser.

During the past ten years, marked progress has been made in job analysis of the occupations and professions and in character and trait analysis. Mr. Charters, a prominent leader in this movement, presents in Section V a review and critique of curriculum-making for the vocations.

The reader will note in the General Statement in Part II, *Foundations of Curriculum-Making,* our commitment to the view that the bases and techniques of curriculum-making in the colleges should not be unlike those employed in the elementary and secondary schools. Since the close of the World War a movement for the reconstruction of collegiate curricula has gathered momentum. Mr. Kelly, who has been concerned for some years with the develop-

ment of research in college administration, presents in Section V of this volume a series of illustrations and evaluations of these beginnings of reconstruction within the college. Finally, we round out our description by setting forth the rôle that state legislatures are playing in our day in curriculum prescriptions. To an astonishing and alarming degree, legislatures are prescribing the content of the materials of instruction. Mr. Flanders, who has made an intensive study of the last quarter century of development, reviews this important matter in Section V.

Description is worth little unless it leads to evaluation—critique. Hence the third task that we have undertaken in preparing these two volumes has been the critical interpretation of both historical developments and contemporary practices. The results of our attempts to appraise the historical movements will be found in Section I, while the evaluation of contemporary practices appear in successive chapters by Mr. Courtis, Mr. Counts, Mr. Bonser, Mr. Charters, Mr. Kelly and in Chapter XXX. In the last chapter Mr. Counts and I undertake to review briefly the chief forces and trends discernible in contemporary public and private school practice.

The third, and really the major interest of the Committee, has been the problem of a more fundamental orientation in curriculum construction. Believing that *divergences* in theory have been overstressed at the expense of *agreements*, we have joined together in the attempt to find a common basis for understanding the problems of curriculum-making. As the "General Statement" says: "We have sought to unite to discover agreements which may serve as a working basis for the next practicable step in curriculum-reconstruction." The methods by which we attack that problem are described in the Foreword to Part II entitled: "An Adventure in Understanding."

Summing up, therefore: Part I of the current Yearbook attempts a description and critical synthesis of curriculum-making, past and present. Part II presents our joint platform for curriculum-construction—a general statement of the foundational principles upon which we desire to see the next steps taken in the reconstruction of the school curriculum.

HAROLD RUGG, *Chairman.*

INTRODUCTION

AN ADVENTURE IN UNDERSTANDING

I

In this volume the Society's Committee on the Technique of Curriculum-Making has assembled the results of prolonged exchange of views concerning the theoretical foundations of curriculum-construction. We are confident that the vigorous impact of opposed schools of thought upon each other is a needed next step in the development of educational theory. So we have organized ourselves into an open forum for the discussion of fundamental divergencies in theory and for seeking a basis of common agreement. We have even conceived it possible to discover that the cleavages between various groups were more apparent than real. For two and a half years, therefore, in roundtable conference and in writing, the members of our curriculum group have discussed their theoretical positions.

The development of educational theory has been much hampered in our day by the lack of intellectual controversy. School men have been more concerned with educational practice, with administration, than with hard thinking concerning the direction in which education is moving and ought to move.

II

Many years ago, the National Herbart Society, the progenitor of our present organization, provided the means by which a few critically-minded persons could come together periodically for the vigorous interchange of views. The first few yearbooks of the National Herbart Society presented clear-cut exhibits of the extent to which contemporary theory developed through the meetings and publications of that society. The early meetings of the Herbartians were, indeed, true educational open forums.

With the development of mass education in America and the startling multiplication of our higher training institutions and teachers' associations, our national societies have become 'listening' organizations. Discussion has waned. Intellectual resistance, the sure prod of rock-bottom thinking, has dwindled. Administration is ousting analysis. Synthesis, indeed, is almost totally lacking.

Coincident with the rapid development of graduate and research institutions and the corresponding desire of leaders to disseminate the new techniques, two important changes have taken place.

First, except for a handful of persons, theory has been neglected. Second, apparently divergent schools of thought have been erected in various educational institutions without a real exchange of view having taken place. Even within our educational institutions, indeed, vigorous protagonists of specific educational theories have created what has appeared to onlookers to be serious differences in attitude. This has been due, in part, at least, to the fact that fundamental educational positions have not been fully understood by the various workers.

We educationalists have always tended to be *protagonists;* all too little have we committed ourselves to the study of *validity.* We seize upon an idea and exploit it. We defend and we attack. No doubt education advances most rapidly by this method, but in our enthusiastic support of one factor in the educative process, we have frequently tended to ignore or minimize others. Correspondingly, our colleagues have assumed that we oppose what we ignore or minimize.

Many examples are at hand. To choose a single one, I refer to the controversy which has raged between the protagonists of the 'child-centered' and the 'subject-organized' curriculum. Two decades and a half ago, Professor Dewey, discussing the importance of "considering the child as the starting point, the center and the end" of education, maintaining that "his development, his growth is the ideal," mentioned in the course of his treatment that education was to be regarded as "for life—not *merely* as preparation for adult life." In his early writings, *School and Society, Child and Curriculum, Interest and Effort,* he laid great stress upon the activity side of child experience and gave only an abbreviated discussion of the other factors in the educative process. However, he did not ignore completely (as our quotations in Chapter XII show) the rôle of race experience, the "social aims, meanings, values incarnate in the matured experience of the adult." He said specifically in a number of places that the "educative process is the due interaction of these forces." But the great preponderance of his discussion consisted of a thorough-going *emphasis* upon growth, child activity, learning as reaction. He illustrated only scantily

the adult phase of the problem. The result has been that the protagonists of more systematic education have assumed that he opposed their point of view. They either overlooked or ignored his definite references to the importance of preparation for adult living, the necessary rôle of the teacher as a guide and interpreter of race experience, and the directive influence toward maximal growth of an organized and planned scheme of materials of instruction (see Chapter XII of this volume).

Historically, therefore, schools of thinking have differed in part because of the difficulty of conveying to each other a vast and intricate array of meanings, with a limited vocabulary. We have had literally a confusion of tongues. We have needed sadly a fusion of vocabularies. Indeed, no more serious problem confronts us in the development of our educational theory than the clear interpenetration of minds, the erection of a common educational vocabulary.

The need is evident, therefore, of bring together in close juxtaposition contrasted educational theories. Especially do we need a synthesis of our theory as well as of our practice—an overview from which we can obtain a balanced perspective of the whole situation.

It was such considerations that led to the organization of our Curriculum Committee. The coöperation was enlisted of persons who were strikingly representative of what were believed to be the opposed positions in curriculum-making.

The production of this yearbook, therefore, has been essentially an adventure in understanding.

We have sought to discover agreements and to clarify divergencies. Both ends have been achieved. The statement of our agreements appears in Chapter I, "The Foundations of Curriculum-Making." Our separate emphases and individual positions are indicated in the subsequent chapters (II to XI inclusive).

The material of this volume has been assembled by the following procedure:

Five roundtables, each lasting from one to two days, have been held during the past two and one half years. At each one from six to ten members of our group have been present. In addition, there have been several other meetings of from two to four members. Preliminary meetings of the smaller number blocked out the procedure.

We were confronted first by the need for a clear definition of the issues between us and for an enumeration of the problems of curriculum-construction. That this might be secured, eight members of our conference prepared individual statements of what they conceived to be the issues and problems of curriculum-making.

Prolonged roundtable discussion of these lists of problems revealed that most of them assumed a subject-centered curriculum. Further consideration of the matter produced a more complete list of issues and problems by bringing the views of the protagonists of an 'activities curriculum' into sharp relief against those who desired to protect the systematization of curriculum-making. The result of our exchange of views on this matter was the list of issues and problems which appears at the close of this introductory statement. The reader should regard this list as the nucleus around which the "General Statement: Foundations of Curriculum-Making," (Chapter I) was constructed.

To provide us with a definite phrasing of the different theoretical positions represented in the Committee, eight members of the Committee prepared individual statements of positions on each of the controversial issues and problems. These statements were duplicated and distributed to all the members who then constituted the Curriculum Committee. (Three persons were added to the Committee after that point in the procedure has been reached.)

IV

We had then approached a point at which it was possible to have a profitable and prolonged exchange of views on the problems of curriculum-construction. A conference was held at which nine members of the group were present throughout five half-day sessions. A stenographic record was made of our discussions. At this meeting, we produced a preliminary joint statement of tentative agreements covering most of the issues in the field.

From the beginning of our discussion it was apparent that we did not understand each other. The chief task which we confronted was the erection of a common vocabulary. We needed synonyms and elaboration of meanings. We found especially that individuals in the group had attached prejudices and aversions to particular terms. For example, the term "project method" caused endless trouble because it had become associated in the minds of several

members of the group with a type of undirected and more or less chaotic school organization which they had seen in operation. Furthermore, they had, in part at least, misconceived the theory of the proponents of the method because of the improper application of the theories in these centers. It was discovered, however, that the advocates of the theory held no brief for the term itself. The canvassing of synonyms and the use of less obnoxious terms brought the two groups much more closely into agreement on meanings and theories.

Certain other terms had, correspondingly, to be abolished. For example, "logical organization," "specialization of learning." Words and phrases had become connected in our minds with persons and groups, with schools of thought which we believed to be opposed to our own. Earlier contacts had alienated us from the positions in question. Hence the irritation of some of us at "minimal essentials" and "logical organizations"—terms which called up in our minds mechanistic schemes of instruction. Or conversely, the "project," which was anathema to the protagonists of systematic, orderly educational procedure. Certain other terms—"experience," for example—were so variously interpreted and so illy defined that we were compelled to discard them or to support them with a wealth of synonym and illustration. The conference nearly broke up over a vigorous debate concerning "periodicity" in development. Vivid exchange of synonym and the substitution of the word "stage" for "period," together with detailed illustration from school practice and studies of learning, enabled us to approximate much closer agreement than we had originally thought possible.

V

Our greatest need, however, was for synthesis.

We represented in our group the tendency for educational theorists to exploit selected aspects of the educational situation. We tended from the beginning to attack or to defend. The nub of our debate revolved around the controversy in curriculum-construction over the respective rôles of child-growth and effective social life. One wing of the Committee emphasized the need for building the curriculum around the activities and interests of children. The other wing stressed preparation for adult life. Reconciliation was produced through the gradual acquiescence of the group in the statement that both points of view are important, indeed, coördinate

in importance. Both views, being represented in the positions of the members of our group, were written into the theoretical statement of our general position. Hence Section II of our General Statement shows that our group could come together by a synthesis of the two emphases and could agree upon a statement which would recognize as coördinate the interests, needs, and activities of children as well as the directive influence of race experience and contemporary adult society. Our discussions, beginning almost always with debate, were dominated by a willingness to listen, and eventuated in real roundtable conferences.

VI

We made other and equally unexpected discoveries. For example, that *all* of our members recognized the need of the teacher for an outline of desirable experiences planned in advance (Section VII). Unanimity on the issue of whether the curriculum should be made entirely 'on the spot' or whether a skeleton of curriculum activities and materials should be prepared in advance was finally secured by a specification of what the 'outline' should contain. Agreement upon this point, previously conceived to be an irreconcilable issue, was found when the two schools of thinking showed each other that they were chiefly concerned that the outline "to be made in advance" should emphasize the great attitudes, appreciations, and meanings which were to be set as the end points of instruction. (Par. 30 *et suiv.*). Thus was relegated to a position of subordinate importance the previous emphasis upon skill, habit-forming, and fact-gathering.

In retrospect, it seems clear that much of our final agreement was secured by emphasizing the fact that this platform of curriculum theory was to be regarded solely as a "next step" platform. From the beginning, our tendency to split up into defending camps was obviated and unity frequently secured by reversion to our fundamental premise: namely, that we were writing a platform of *practical forward steps* in curriculum-making, that our principles were being phrased to fit the difficult administrative conditions of public education, namely, large classes, wide individual differences, heavy teaching programs, inadequate facilities, lack of well-trained teachers. This premise became, indeed, our surest means of reconcilia-

tion of differences. Hence, the clear-cut statement which appears in the introductory section of our General Statement.

VII

By this process of developing understanding, therefore, we finally produced a platform of tentative agreements.

In the succeeding months, we individually re-phrased portions of our statement, exchanged views in writing and came together in a series of roundtables for their further consideration. New members joining the group caused a recanvassing of positions, enlargement of vocabulary, a wider search for illustrations and acceptable teminology.

"Foundations of Curriculum-Making," which appears as Chapter I of this volume, is the result of our adventure in understanding. It sets forth our agreements.

We are under no delusion that we have reached *complete* reconciliation of our earlier oppositions. That we are much closer than when we started will be clear to all who study the General Statement carefully. Nevertheless, there remained divergencies. To define them, nine members of the group have prepared supplemental statements illustrating in many instances their conception of specific statements, laying stress upon the points of view and issues which they regard as most fundamental and bringing out, where necessary, their unwillingness to accept completely a given point of view. In one case, indeed, the writing of the separate chapter led to a brief, but very synthetic statement of the author's educational theory.

VIII

As the various members of the committee organized the material for the two volumes of this yearbook, there gradually emerged the need for viewing the theory of curriculum-construction, as well as its practice, in broad historical perspective. For this reason, the decision was finally reached to include in this present volume an assembly of the theoretical statements concerning curriculum-making of a number of the leading Herbartians and of Professor Dewey. The latter, over a longer period of time than any other single individual, has phrased the point of view of the advocates of a child-growth curriculum. In Chapter XII, therefore, we have

assembled a series of quotations taken from his writings dealing with the curriculum from 1894 to 1926, inclusive. To round out our historical perspective and to illustrate the manner in which educational theory revolves around certain recurrent fundamental issues, we have assembled also statements of the theory of the curriculum from the writings of eight of the leading Herbartians.

IX

We trust that the readers of this Part II will view it in the light of the chapters of Part I. Curriculum *theory* must be considered in the light of curriculum *practice*. Curriculum-making, both past and present, has been treated in Volume I. Either one of these volumes taken alone, therefore, presents merely a partial analysis of the total problem.

We know full well that the necessary brevity of our words will undoubtedly lead even now to misunderstanding of our joint platform and of our individual positions. On crucial matters we have sought to employ in the General Statement such a wealth of synonym and illustration that misunderstanding will be less probable. Although we have striven conscientiously to be clear, undoubtedly there may be elements of our statement which need further amplification.

The danger in publishing the General Statement is clear: namely, that this will be taken as a set of principles to be blindly followed. It should be clear that it is not *adoption* of these principles that is needed most. No, it is *hard thinking* about the issues and problems of curriculum-construction that we desire. Our hope is that the General Statement will be used as a basis for vigorous discussion by teachers, administrators, curriculum-makers, and those engaged in the training of teachers. "Foundations of Curriculum-Making" is a bone of contention to be chewed upon and not a platform to stand upon.

HAROLD RUGG, *Chairman.*

LIST OF FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS ON CURRICULUM-MAKING

USED AS THE BASIS FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE GENERAL STATEMENT: FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM-MAKING

1. What period of life does schooling primarily contemplate as its end?
2. How can the curriculum prepare for effective participation in adult life?
3. Are the curriculum-makers of the schools obliged to formulate a point of view concerning the merits or deficiencies of American civilization?
4. Should the school be regarded as a conscious agency for social improvement?
 A. Should the school be planned on the assumption that it is to fit children to 'live in' the current social order or to rise above and lift it after them? Are children merely to be 'adjusted' to the institutions of current society or are they to be so educated that they will be impelled to modify it? Are they to accept it or to question it?
5. How shall the content of the curriculum be conceived and stated?
6. What is the place and function of subject matter in the educative process?
 A. Subject matter is primarily matter-set-out-to-be-learned. It is the conscious and specific end of school activity (educative process), and the learning activity is exactly and precisely means to this end.
 B. Subject matter and learnings are properly both subsequent and subordinate to some normal life activity or experience (the educative process) already under way from other considerations. Subject matter is called for when, and because, this life activity has been balked for lack of a certain way of behaving. This needed *way of behaving,* as it is sought, found, and acquired, is that we properly call subject matter. Its function is to enable the balked activity to proceed.
7. What portion of education should be classified as "general" and what portion as "specialized" or "vocational" or purely "optional?" To what extent is general education to run parallel with vocational education and to what extent is the latter to follow on the completion of the former?
8. Is the curriculum to be made in advance?
9. To what extent is the 'organization' of the subject matter a matter of pupil-thinking and construction of, or planning by, the professional curriculum-maker as a result of experimentation?
10. From the point of view of the educator, when has 'learning' taken place?

11. To what extent should traits be learned in their 'natural' setting (*i.e.*, in a 'life-situation')?
12. To what degree should the curriculum provide for individual differences?
13. To what degree is the concept of "minimal essentials" to be used in curriculum-construction?
14. What should be the form of organization of the curriculum? Shall it be one of the following or will you adopt others?
 a. A flexibly graded series of suggestive activities with reference to subject matter which may be used in connection with the activities? Or
 b. A rigidly graded series of activities with subject matter included with each respective activity? Or,
 c. A graded sequence of subject matter with suggestion for activities to which the subject matter is related? Or,
 d. A statement of achievements expected for each grade, a list of suggestive activities, and an outline of related subject matter, through the use of which the grade object may be achieved? Or,
 e. A statement of grade objectivities in terms of subject matter and textual and reference materials which will provide this subject matter without any specific reference to activities?
15. What, if any, use shall be made of the spontaneous interests of children?
16. For the determination of what types of material (activities, reading, discussion problems and topics, group projects, etc.) should the curriculum-maker analyze the activities in which adults actually engage?
 1. For skills and factual material?
 2. For group activities?
 3. For problems and issues of contemporary life?
17. How far shall methods of learning be standardized? For example, is it probable that current principles of learning will favor the use of 'practice' devices? For individuals? For groups? How is drill to be provided?
 a. By assignment, under penalty, of specially chosen drill material?
 b. By such personal practice as the felt connections call for?
18. Administrative questions of curriculum-making.
 a. For what time units shall the curriculum be organized?
 b. For what geographic units shall the curriculum be made?
 1. In the United States
 2. Individual states
 3. A county
 4. An individual school
 c. Shall a curriculum be made especially for rural schools?
 d. What is the optimal form in which to publish the course of study?

CHAPTER I

THE FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM-MAKING

A COMPOSITE STATEMENT BY THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY'S COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM-MAKING

I. Introductory: The Next Practical Steps in Curriculum-Making
II. Curriculum-Construction in the Light of Both Study of Child Growth and Effective Social Life
III. Curriculum-Making and the Scientific Study of Society
IV. The School as a Conscious Agency for Social Improvement
V. The Curriculum and Social Integration
VI. Changing Conceptions of Learning and of the Subject Matter of the Curriculum
VII. The Teacher's Need for an Outline of Desirable Experiences Planned in Advance
VIII. The Place of the School Subjects in Instruction
IX. Continuous and Comprehensive Curriculum-Study.
X. Measuring the Outcomes of Instruction
XI. The Rôle of Teacher-Training Institutions in the Reconstruction of the Curriculum
XII. Problems of Administrative Adjustment in Curriculum-Making

THE FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM-MAKING

I. Introductory: The Next Practical Steps in Curriculum Making

1. In order to render a possible service to actual curriculum-makers—superintendents, supervisors, teachers, and other students of education—we, the members of the Committee of the National Society for the Study of Education on the Technique of Curriculum-Making, have agreed upon the following general statement of working principles of curriculum-making. This statement is intended to call attention to the direction in which curriculum-making is moving at present in its attempt to solve its major problems. For the purpose at hand each member of the Committee has not insisted upon the acceptance of his own complete curriculum theory: on

the contrary, he has sought to unite with the others to discover agreements which may serve as a working basis for the next practicable steps—certain of them transitional—of the progressive revision of the school curriculum. The statement, being composite, aims to present agreements, leaving points of divergence to the individual statements found later in the Yearbook.

2. It is the judgment of the Committee that the principles laid down in this general statement apply equally well to all periods of the American school system. Specifically, we believe that the principles are equally applicable, with appropriate adaptations, to the construction of the curriculum of the elementary, the secondary, and the college levels. It is only as those who are responsible for the construction of college curricula come to employ such principles as are herein set forth that we shall have a truly continuous scheme of public education.

II. Curriculum Construction in the Light of Both the Study of Child Growth and Effective Social Life

3. An important question confronts the curriculum-maker: What period of life does the school primarily contemplate as its end —adult life, or the present life of the learner? In curriculum-making, attention should be given to the interests, needs, and activities both of child life and of adult society.

4. In times past, and too much in the present, school practice has imposed adult forms of thought, feeling, and behavior upon children. It must, indeed, be recognized that the best conceivable forms of adult behavior represent goals toward which the education of the child must proceed. But, much more vigorously than has been true in the past, it must be recognized that the steps necessary in moving toward these goals are dictated by the character of the child's interests, needs, capacities for learning, and experiences, as well as by the larger demands of society.

5. From the educational point of view, childhood and adulthood together form one continuous development. Each stage in this succession is to be considered as having a character and quality of its own. Each stage should leave the individual best prepared to live the next stage and, through this, all others. Any one stage overlaps, in character, other stages. The proper construction of the curricu-

lum requires recognition of this fact, along with the recognition of the special character of each of the stages and the necessity for adjusting the work of the various stages in such a way that they shall contribute most fully to the development of the individual.

6. Curriculum-making has not only failed to take adequate account of child life; it has failed as truly to take account of adult life. From the very nature of development, it is understood that there can be no conflict between proper education and preparation for later life. Differences of opinion still exist as to the extent to which immediate experiences of child life may determine the practices and procedures constituting this proper child training, but all agree that its ultimate test is the effectiveness with which subsequent situations are met by the individual so educated.

7. In establishing the relative importance of proposed materials of instruction (that is, in selecting and validating the materials) the curriculum-maker is compelled to decide what use he shall make of the present needs, interests, and activities of children on the one hand, and also of the results accruing from the scientific study of society on the other.

8. We would stress the principle that in the selection and validation of curriculum-materials expert analysis must be made both of the activities of adults and of the activities and interests of children. The data from adult life go far to determine what is of permanent value; the data from child life go far to determine what is appropriate for education in each stage of the child's development. Children's interests are of major importance, but unless the expressed interest is in something proved by social analysis to be desirable or may be easily directed toward some activity that is desirable, it should be eliminated. To validate any experience for any particular time, both child interest and social value in the control of behavior should be used as tests. The ultimate test, therefore, of the value of an organization of curriculum-materials is the effectiveness of child learning.

9. It is necessary to emphasize the social nature of the individual. The individual becomes an individual in the best sense only through participation in society. He grows as an individual by appropriating the modes of behavior developed in society. It is of paramount importance, therefore, that the individual participate effectively in social life.

10. In recent educational discussion of the matter, a seeming antithesis has appeared between the interests of society as a whole and those of the individual. We believe that this antithesis is only an apparent one. It is recognized that the public school is called upon in every case to minister to the development of the individual as an individual and quite as emphatically to secure control of those forms of communication and types of behavior which are necessary for life in the social group. This latter is to be regarded as an absolutely essential requirement of an educational system.

In the past the school has recognized this principle, but in its effort to develop control of communication and number, it has too frequently fallen into a formalism which defeated in great measure the fundamental social processes of the school.

11. An important principle to guide the reconstruction of the school is this, therefore: the curriculum can prepare for effective participation in social life by providing a present life of experiences which increasingly identifies the child with the aims and activities derived from analysis of social life as a whole.

III. Curriculum-Making and the Scientific Study of Society

12. The curriculum-maker must become a student both of the child and of society and the accumulating experience of the race.

13. Curriculum-making includes three technical tasks of major importance: the determination of the ultimate and immediate objectives of education; the experimental discovery of appropriate child activities and other materials of instruction; and the like discovery of the most effective modes of selecting and organizing the activities of the respective grades of the school.

14. Curriculum-making will increasingly make use of scientific procedure. The materials of instruction (individual and group activities of children, reading, open-forum discussions, excursions, what not) will be chosen in the light of the analysis and appraisal of the activities in which people, old and young, most universally and permanently engage. This is just as necessary in the case of the finer types of appreciation as in the case of the most highly specialized skills. Not only will the materials of instruction emerge from a scientific study of society, but, in addition, the discovery of the sound purposes of education will be furthered by such study.

15. The skills and important factual materials which are of frequent, crucial, and nearly universal use will emerge directly from analysis of social needs. Furthermore, the dynamic materials of the curriculum (that is, the finer appreciations, the dynamic attitudes, the crucial problems, the institutions, and the relationships of contemporary life) will be most fully discovered by the same scientific analysis of society. Correspondingly, the curriculum-maker will conduct scientific studies of the interests and abilities of children at various stages of maturity, and of methods of learning. Upon the conclusions from such studies, the organization of instruction will increasingly be based.

IV. The School as a Conscious Agency for Social Improvement

16. It is of increasing moment that our educational agencies be organized for the task of bringing children to a progressive understanding of their responsibility for social progress and of the problems, practices, and institutions of social life. Throughout their school careers, pupils should be given opportunities to think about these problems and institutions, to develop attitudes of understanding and tolerance, and to perfect habits of right conduct and creative self-expression. Because other agencies—such as the typical American home, the press, the church, the platform—cannot exert an adequate educational influence for social improvement, it is imperative that the systematic curriculum of our schools shall consider definitely the problems of economic, political, social, and individual life. Only through frequent and definite practice in clear thinking and right feeling about these problems and issues can children grow in the power to meet them.

17. We believe, therefore, that curriculum-makers are obligated to consider definitely the merits and deficiencies of American civilization. In so far as this consideration is in conformity with the dominent public opinion, little, if any, difficulty will be encountered in introducing materials into the curriculum for the purpose of using the school as a conscious agency for social improvement. But when controversial issues are raised in the school curriculum (as they must be raised), opposition may be encountered. At this point the curriculum-maker must take care that the material presented

and the treatment given shall be fair to all sides. The chief aim will not be to reach final solutions for such problems—still less to establish any prior chosen position—but to build in the children methods of attacking controversial issues and increasingly to develop attitudes of open-mindedness and sympathetic tolerance. In the raising of controversial issues for consideration in the school, careful attention should be given to the educative effect upon the children and to the sensitivity of the community.

18. In this connection, we respectfully suggest that it is not the function of legislative bodies to prescribe the detailed contents of the school curriculum. The people, through their legislative representatives, may properly formulate a general statement of the aims and purposes of education. The task, however, of discovering appropriate materials of instruction through which to achieve those aims and purposes, is a technical one of great difficulty, demanding special professional preparation. Neither the general statement of the aims and purposes of education nor the task of discovering appropriate materials can safely be left to organizations which represent minority interests. The propaganda and interference of these minority groups in school matters constitutes one of the greatest menaces in modern education.

V. The Curriculum and Social Integration

19. A proper integration is necessary to satisfactory social life.

20. The Committee records its judgment that in so far as the curriculum is prepared in advance, the materials of at least the first nine grades, and increasingly of the grades beyond, will be organized so as to produce knowledge, skills, and appreciations necessary to the common life of our people. In making this statement we understand, however, that there will be a wider range of outcomes than has hitherto been true. The scientific study of society establishes the desirability of securing through public education, mastery of the commonly used meanings, relationships, and skills.

21. In caring for these common elements in curriculum-making careful attention must be given to comparative values. If the term "minimal essentials" is to be used at all in describing the common materials of the curriculum, it should be so used as to include the important attitudes, generalizations, and appreciations, and an

understanding of the important institutions and problems of life, as well as the conventional skills and knowledges which hitherto have played a dominant rôle.

22. In stressing the importance of common elements in the curriculum, we recognize fully that there should be different expectations with respect to the accomplishment of children who learn rapidly and those who learn slowly. The curriculum should provide for individual differences. In so far as possible under the administrative handicaps of large classes and a wide range of abilities, curricular provisions should be made specifically for several levels of ability.

23. No definite line can be drawn between general and vocational education. Education may be characterized as being *"vocational"* when the curriculum content is selected in the light of its appropriateness for a specific calling—when the ideals, knowledges, and skills that are developed make for successful adjustment and control in the chosen calling. This will mean that there will be at all levels of vocational education some curricular content that is appropriate to general education. The extent to which the general element should be present can be determined only by analysis of the situation calling for vocational education and the time at the disposal of the learner.

VI. Changing Conceptions of Learning and of the Subject Matter of the Curriculum

24. In times past, and too largely in present school practice, the curriculum has been conceived primarily as formal subject matter (facts, processes, principles), set-out-to-be-learned without adequate relation to life. The pupil has too frequently been required to repeat words, express ideas which he does not understand, and to accept, adopt, and use materials which have been furnished him ready-made and completely organized by the teacher. 'Learning' was thought of as the ability to give back upon demand certain phrases and formulas which had been acquired without adequate understanding of their meaning and content.

25. In recent years, however, we have come to recognize that there are many different forms of memorizing and learning. Some of these are permanently advantageous; others are fruitless for

the development of the child. The forms of learning which should be encouraged are those which lead on the intellectual side to generalization, on the habit side to the cultivation of useful skills, and on the side of attitudes and appreciation to the recognition of those relations which are most permanently satisfying. Advantageous learning affects favorably the individual's behavior. Meaning grows only through reaction. The term "true learning" therefore, is applied to any change in the control of conduct which permanently modifies the individual's mode of reacting upon his environment. Advantageous learning is never guaranteed by mere formulation of subject matter which is used in instruction. The teacher must patiently strive to bring the pupil to the point where the best arrangements of subject matter are made his own for actual conduct through the process of true learning.

26. Increasingly, "subject matter," likewise, is taking on a different conception, correlative with the changed conception of learning. The essential element in "subject matter" is probably now best conceived as "ways of responding," or of reacting. From one point of view, "subject matter" will be conceived as the best mode of behavior that the race has discovered; from another point of view, the actual ways of responding that the learner is building into his own character.

27. New subject matter is brought into the curriculum as race experience, therefore, to provide patterns of response which the learner needs at any stage of his growth. Learning, for the educator, however, is not satisfactory until the new way of behavior (that is, the new mode of response) has been so built into the learner's nervous system that it may be reasonably expected to function efficiently when the proper time comes. The final test of learning is the emergence of appropriate conduct.

28. The curriculum should be conceived, therefore, in terms of a succession of experiences and enterprises having a maximum of lifelikeness for the learner. The materials of instruction should be selected and organized with a view to giving the learner that development most helpful in meeting and controlling life situations. Learning takes place most effectively and economically in the matrix of a situation which grips the learner, which is to him vital—worth while. Traits learned in a natural, or lifelike setting, give

promise of emerging definitely in appropriate conduct. It is the task of the teacher and the curriculum-maker, therefore, to select and organize materials which will give the learner that development most helpful in meeting and controlling life situations. The method by which the learner works out these experiences, enterprises, exercises, should be such as calls for maximal self-direction, assumption of responsibility, of exercise of choice in terms of life values.

29. The learner must, in general, as regards any particular problem, conception, or solution of a problem, approximate the best available form of racial organization through his own personal mode of assimilation. In helping the learner to reach this approximation, the intelligent teacher will use the methods which have been proved by previous educational experience to be most effective. No formulated scheme of assimilation, made in advance, and handed out complete by the curriculum-maker, can, of itself, be sufficient. To be truly functional for him, the process of assimilation must be the pupil's own. This does not, however, deny the effective part that the good teacher or other expert may have in assisting the pupil. The curriculum-maker should arrange activities and materials so as to give the learner carefully planned assistance.

VII. The Teacher's Need For an Outline of Desirable Experiences Planned in Advance

30. In this process of curriculum-making, it is necessary that a teacher have at hand at any stage of his teaching an outline of the general attitudes, the finer appreciations, the important concepts and meanings, and the generalizations which he wishes to secure as part of the outcomes of his instruction. Not only must he have this outline of attitudes, appreciations, meanings, etc., which he sets as the goals of instruction, but, to be reasonably sure that these come out of the instruction, the activities of children (including all the kinds of work we do in the school) should be planned in outline form in advance.

31. Another way of stating the matter is that that part of the curriculum should be planned in advance which includes (1) a statement of objectives, (2) a sequence of experiences shown by analysis to be reasonably uniform in value in achieving the objectives, (3) subject matter found to be reasonably uniform as the

best means of engaging in the experiences, and (4) statements of immediate outcomes of achievements to be derived from the experiences. That part of the curriculum from which selection of supplementary experiences and materials are to be used as conditions locally suggest, should be planned partly in advance and should be made partly as new materials become available. That part of the curriculum which represents the daily life-situations and interests from which the immediate specific needs of students arise, should be—can only be—made from day to day.

32. Because of partially equipped teachers, and of heavy teaching programs, large classes, and inadequate research facilities, it will be necessary to utilize persons specially trained and experienced in the study of society and of childhood to organize suggestive activities, readings, exercises.

33. The tasks of curriculum-making stated in the foregoing paragraph require special training and experience in the scientific analysis of social needs on the one hand and in the experimental study of the learners' interests, activities, and methods of learning on the other. Education is progressively adopting the methods of science. Curriculum-making, correspondingly, is creating a progressive demand for specialization and for professional, scientific training, and experience.

VIII. The Place of the School Subjects in Instruction

34. Prevalent practice groups the materials of instruction in a series of school subjects. This grouping is in part, at least, caused by the fact that, whenever the mind attempts to understand the world and to formulate explanations of the world, there appears inevitably the psychological necessity of analysis. The mind can not grasp reality as a whole. It must approach reality from various sides and must gain experience in sections. The natural result of this law of mental life is a tendency to formulate experience in distinct and separate groups of observations and series of related judgments. The accumulation of knowledge has tended inevitably toward specialization, and the individual, in learning, tends to view the world from restricted or specialized points of view. It is desirable that education broaden the range of the individual's view

as much as possible, but it is a psychological impossibility to escape specialization in some degree.

35. Teachers and students of education have long recognized the serious problem which confronts the school because this tendency to specialize has divided human knowledge into various sharply differentiated bodies of principles which we know as separate subject matters. To concentrate on one line of subject matter is to satisfy the psychological tendency to specialize, but such concentration leads to a narrow view of the world which is not satisfactory, especially when one attempts to deal with the world in a practical way.

36. This scheme of thoroughly systematized and classified knowledge developed through a long social evolution has many elements of proved worth and should not be lightly discarded. There is, however, a considerable movement in many quarters to break down certain traditional lines of demarcation between the school subjects. For example, general mathematics has been approved for the junior-high-school grades by the Mathematical Association of America, and its further re-organization is being tried in many schools beyond the junior-high-school grades. In recent years there has been a parallel movement in the field of general science. This is shown by the marked increase in the percentage of high-school students who pursue general science rather than the separate sciences. Similarly, combinations in the literary subjects are being experimented with; for example, trials are being made of teaching spelling and composition together and of teaching composition with certain other types of subject matter. All of these new combinations of subject matter go to show that a reorganization of certain phases of the school curriculum is now actually under way.

37. The chief reason for the criticism of existing subject divisions is that, as now organized, some of the barriers between school subjects hinder true learning, rather than promote it. From the study of industrial, political, and social life, illustrations abound of the fact that the present subject divisions of the curriculum tend in some cases to isolate meanings, principles, movements, and forces which, to be truly understood, must be studied in the close relationships of their natural settings.

38. One of the chief intellectual purposes of the school is to develop understanding of the institutions, problems, and issues of

contemporary life. Historically, whenever a rapid transformation of the conditions of living has taken place, the tendency has been for the curriculum to lag behind. Because of the great changes in modern life, there is at present a real need in certain fields for a new synthesis of knowledge and, correspondingly, for a new grouping of the materials of the school.

39. To take a single example, it is impossible to initiate pupils into an adequate understanding of world affairs without assembling in close relationship such facts, movements, and generalizations as those which deal with natural resources, economic imperialism, international diplomacy, world trade, nationalism, and the like. These facts and generalizations are now scattered in the several separate subjects of geography, political history, economics, industrial and social history, etc. These and other illustrations indicate the necessity of grouping in broader units much material which is now distributed through several distinct school subjects.

40. This proposal does not imply the mere merging or fusing of the present content of existing school subjects. It implies, on the contrary, that the materials of instruction should be assembled from the starting point of the needs of the learner, irrespective of the content and boundaries of existing subjects. Where the needs of the learner in one field demand new subject matter or make the use of subject matter from another field desirable, the present content of the subjects and the subject-matter divisions should not be permitted to act as barriers to the improvement of instruction. There is nothing sacred about the present content and organization of the various subjects.

41. The criterion, therefore, which should exercise the greatest control over the organization of the materials of instruction is the criterion of true learning. Meanings, principles, institutions, modes of living, should be discussed in such natural relationships that youth can develop reasoned control over them. Pupils must come to view the forces as well as the structures of society as a whole.

42. As the reorganization of the curriculum proceeds, therefore, some existing subject divisions may disappear as separate units in the curriculum; some may be retained, and new ones may make their appearance. In certain quarters, efforts are being made to construct curricula in terms of purposes and activities, rather than

in terms of subjects. Should these prove by measurement and experimental study to raise the efficiency of teaching and learning, it is conceivable that far-reaching reorganizations of the curriculum might be made also in this way.

43. The Committee heartily commends experimentation now under way in schools and colleges attempting to unite in single general courses bodies of knowledge which heretofore have been separated. For example, geography, civics, and history, the various branches of mathematics, and the several natural sciences and the science of man. We believe that the teachers should be encouraged to carry on with vigor experiments in formulating and testing such combination courses with a view of discovering how far it is possible to gain the fullest advantages from both specialization and synthetic treatment.

44. However, in view of the many innovations that are appearing as a result of the attempt to adjust the curriculum to changed social and individual needs, greater care than ever before should be exercised to validate proposed changes experimentally. The general criterion which should determine permanent adoptions of new types of organization should be measured contributions to the facilitation of the true learning process.

IX. Continuous and Comprehensive Curriculum-Study

45. School practice, both past and present, has conceived too generally of curriculum-revision as a task for intermittent administrative reorganization. The Committee believes, on the contrary, that because of the dynamic nature of modern society and of the steady accumulation of truth concerning learning and child growth, school systems and colleges should make provisions for the continuous study, evaluation, and testing of the materials of the school curriculum, and the importation of new materials or the elimination of old kinds whenever this proves to be justifiable.

46. In local school systems it is particularly important that adequate central machinery be created for the continuous study of the school curriculum. In this work, the coöperation of experienced teachers should be secured, together with that of specialists in curriculum-making. The Committee heartily commends the practice of releasing efficient teachers from active class work to participate

in the study of the content and organization of the curriculum materials within their chosen fields of work.

47. Curriculum-study should not only be carried on continuously; it should also be comprehensive. The curriculum has grown up, subject by subject, as specialized knowledge has accumulated. The history of curriculum-making, therefore, has revealed the corresponding tendency to revise the curriculum, subject by subject. Almost always local school officers and national committees appointed by organizations of subject-matter specialists have revised the curriculum by this method. As has just been discussed (Section VIII), it appears from time to time needful to bring about regroupings of subject matter. However, because of the tendency to revise the curriculum along the lines of the definitely established school subjects, and because of the great prestige of the recommendations of national committees appointed by organizations of subject-matter specialists, it has been difficult to secure such regroupings as were discussed in the foregoing section.

48. The Committee believes that curriculum-makers should seek on every possible occasion to develop sympathetic, broad views of the world. Especially should the treatment of human relations be of a type which will include as many lines of consideration as can efficiently be brought together in the experience of pupils. If this principle is to be carried out in the reconstruction of the curriculum, schools and national organizations, in organizing curriculum committees, should guarantee that the personnel of such committees view American life and the task of curriculum-making in a broad way. This means especially that the personnel of committees shall be constituted of persons of varied interests and equipments. They should include some person interested and equipped for the scientific study of learners' interests, activities, and methods of learning, others trained and experienced in the scientific study of society, and still others who are subject-matter specialists, experienced in the authentication of material. It should be recognized, therefore, that the tasks of curriculum-making are varied and difficult, demanding the coöperation of specialists of the several types. In curriculum-making by committees great care should be taken to insure that a rounded view of the modern world will be reflected in the curriculum through the representation of each of the primary

interests involved, and that the material shall be organized so as to insure economical and effective learning.

X. Measuring the Outcomes of Instruction

49. One of the most potent forms of curriculum-control is measurement by means of uniform examinations and standardized tests. Teachers and pupils will inevitably work for the elements represented in the instruments by which their success is measured; therefore, it is of the utmost importance that changes in goals and methods be accompanied by the development and use of new tests and examinations corresponding in type to the advances made in the curriculum. To serve a useful purpose, tests must be fitted to the requirements of the curriculum and to the requirements of method. They must be determined by the purposes set up in the curriculum for the group of children being tested.

50. This Committee condemns emphatically the evaluation of the product of educational effort solely by means of subject-matter types of examinations now prevalent in state and local school systems. We have reference specifically to the rigid control over the school curriculum exercised by those administrative examinations which over-emphasize the memory of facts and principles and tend to neglect the more dynamic outcomes of instruction.

51. The foregoing statement is not to be construed as interfering in any way with tests of any character given intelligently for general scientific research.

XI. The Rôle of Teacher-Training Institutions in the Reconstruction of the Curriculum

52. The acceptance of the foregoing principles in curriculum-making imposes a new duty upon teacher-training institutions. The curriculum can be changed no more rapidly than the teachers can do their proper part. Our teacher-training institutions, therefore, should not only prepare prospective teachers to teach in the public schools as they now exist, but should also make definite provisions to prepare them to help bring about the better instruction contemplated in this statement. This means specifically that teacher-training institutions should acquaint their students with alternative modes of instruction and alternative modes of curriculum-construc-

tion. This will not only keep them in touch with the most recent developments in curriculum-making, but will, at the same time, provide an important method by which teachers can be practiced in the art of thinking about one of their chief tasks.

XII. Problems of Administrative Adjustment in Curriculum-Making

(The following statements concerning administrative adjustments are to be accepted only in the light of the principles set forth in the entire General Statement.)

A. The Time-Units for the School Curriculum

53. For those schools organized in accordance with present practice the curriculum should be made to fit time-units corresponding to the promotion periods. In some schools this will mean that the curriculum may be organized by years and in other schools by half-years.

54. To guide teachers, the "courses of study" should suggest the approximate time to be spent on each sub-unit. Perhaps this can be done most effectively by specifying minimal and maximal time-allotments. The two factors which enter into the statement of minimal and maximal allotments are the value of the unit and the time required for pupils to master it. Practically, the factor which will determine the minimal allotment is the time required by strong classes to learn the unit, while the maximal time is based upon the needs of slower classes. This plan of stating the approximate time needed for each unit is helpful to teachers, particularly inexperienced ones, because it enables them to keep a balance among the large and varied list of units in a subject. It is important to know, for example, the number of words which a pupil can be expected to master in a week or the time which should be required to do certain types of problems in arithmetic. Furthermore, a teacher especially needs such a guide in the more complex subjects of citizenship and history. Otherwise, it is not impossible that he may give more time to De Soto than to the Westward Movement and more to John Smith than to the problems of immigration or the growth of cities. The classroom teacher does not have at his disposal the data which are necessary either to appraise the relative value of one unit

as compared with another or to determine the amount of time needed by efficient teachers to teach that unit.

55. If the scheme of instruction for a school is that of individualization of instruction or of some other variant form of organization, a corresponding change will have to be made in the way in which the curriculum is administered.

B. The Extent of Local Adaptations in Curriculum-Making

56. Although it is important for the teaching staff in any system to be constantly sensitive to the needs and opportunities in the life of the community outside of school, this does not mean that individual schools, individuals cities, individual counties, or even individual states need to make their whole curriculum locally. The variability in the educational needs among communities has been greatly exaggerated. Certainly for the "three R's" and for much of the remainder of the course of study the differences in the educational needs of one community as compared with another are of secondary importance. Moreover, even when the differences are greatest, it must be kept in mind that local staffs rarely have either the time or the training to make a scientific analysis and interpretation of the educational needs of the community. In spelling, for example, an adequate count of words used by adults and children in writing has been made both for city and for country needs, as well as for educational needs in every geographical division. There is now available a count for every state in the union. Careful examination of these counts does not reveal words of fundamental value in one section of the country which are not also found in the analysis of the vocabulary needs of the other sections. It is true that, from the nature of subjects of the "three R" type, the variation among communities may be expected to be less than would be found in recreational needs or in the specific type of proper conduct.

57. Local school staffs will have the time necessary to make adjustments to such local needs as may exist, only if they have most of the curriculum made for them. In order to utilize the contributions of specialists and to afford time for local staffs to make such adaptations as are locally needed, the curriculum will contain therefore much material common to the country as a whole. Every locality, however, should employ local illustrative material. Moreover, such variations as are needed locally probably fall into a few

large types, so that courses of study for all schools of one type can also be made by trained curriculum-workers. For example, such adaptations could readily be made for schools in congested areas in large cities or for schools in sparsely settled rural communities.

58. The foregoing principles can be applied specifically to the question of adaptations of the curriculum to differing urban and rural needs. Some have wished the rural child so educated that he will stay on the farm. The individual should, however, be so educated that he can choose wisely his own life and occupation. Any infringement of this principle is to be deprecated. However, nothing herein should be construed as suggesting that it is not the duty of the rural school to make rural life as attractive and efficient as possible.

Signed:

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY
FRANKLIN BOBBITT
FREDERICK G. BONSER
WERRETT W. CHARTERS
GEORGE S. COUNTS
STUART A. COURTIS
ERNEST HORN
CHARLES H. JUDD
FREDERICK J. KELLY
WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK
HAROLD RUGG (Chairman)
GEORGE A. WORKS

CHAPTER II

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

W. C. BAGLEY
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

It is fairly predictable that changes in the elementary curriculum in the immediate future will be largely in the nature of a further refinement of materials and their better adaptation to the capacities of the learner.

The refining process has been under way for a long time. It has recently been accelerated by the application of objective methods for determining the items of knowledge and skill that have the largest value. In this connection notable progress has been made in the fields of arithmetic, spelling, and handwriting. Promising work has been done in language and grammar. Suggestive beginnings have been made in geography and history.

The better adaptation of materials to learning capacities has resulted, in part, from the refinement of materials. This is especially true of arithmetic and spelling. In part, too, it has proceeded somewhat independently of the actual materials or subject matter involved in the learning, as in the case of silent reading. In other cases it has itself stimulated further efforts toward the refinement of materials, as in the development of individual instruction.

The large groups of elementary, or 'fundamental,' materials seem to be fairly well stabilized. The basic language-arts and the basic arts of computation and measurement occupy the place of major importance in universal education. This is true of the elementary schools of all civilized countries. The degree of universal enlightenment that can be attained through universal literacy is clearly the first and most fundamental objective of mass-education.

Beyond these basic social arts, there is in most of the civilized countries a very serious emphasis upon direct moral instruction, either through the teaching of religion or, as in France, through an elaborate system of moral instruction on a secular basis. In American education there is very little that corresponds to either of these practices. There is, however, a growing tendency in our country

to recognize the various phases of civic and health education as ranking close to the fundamental social arts in importance.

As subjects of formal instruction, geography and national history apparently form the backbone of the elementary curriculum on the side of information as distinguished from skills. This is generally true of elementary education wherever it has developed beyond the most rudimentary stages. It suggests that the broadening of the 'space horizon' and the extension of the 'time horizon' are recognized as important functions of the universal school, once a reasonable degree of literacy has been insured.

It is chiefly within these fundamental subjects, then, that progress has been made in the refinement of materials and in better adaptation to learning capacities. It is here undoubtedly that the principal progress must be looked for in the immediate future. While tradition and imitation have doubtless had some share in giving to these types or groups of materials a place of paramount importance, there can be little doubt that they are also in part the product of an evolutionary process in which, so far as types or species are concerned, the fittest have survived. It is, so to speak, the varieties within the species that are the principal objects of our present-day curriculum-research. Some of these are being eradicated, others pruned, others transplanted to a more favorable soil, still others cultivated and freed from wasteful competition. For example, "alligation" and "partial payments" have been pulled up by the roots; formal grammar has been pruned pretty close to the bare trunk; the systematic study of arithmetic has been transplanted from the first to the second, and now even to the third school year; and, freed from the competition of arithmetic, the subject of reading has been much more intensively cultivated in the first two grades. These are all illustrations of 'telic' evolution in the elementary curriculum.

Not all of the deliberately purposed changes in the elementary curriculum have been in the direction of progress. The reaction against the formal teaching of spelling, for example, and the belief that the specific spelling 'bonds' can be fixed 'incidentally' had an influence that may be clearly seen in the time-allotments of city elementary schools during the first decade of the present century. The pendulum swung back, however, during the second decade, and to-day the need of attention to the mastery of spelling "in its own

right,'' so to speak, is generally conceded. Formal grammar has had a somewhat similar experience. Efforts to dispense entirely with the study of the structure and functions of language-forms, on the ground that clear and correct expression is solely a matter of good models and constant practice, have not been successful. The present tendency is to recognize a place for the study of grammatical categories and rules, but a serious effort is being made to determine just what materials of formal grammar are of the greatest service in fixing habits of good expression.

'Telic' evolution, then, like natural evolution, involves a certain measure of 'trial and error.' Changes or variations that are made deliberately on the basis of apparently sound theory may not be in the direction of progress. As in biological evolution, the chances that a variation will mean real improvement become smaller the more extreme is the change. This does not mean that even the most radical proposals should not be carefully considered if backed by apparently sound reasoning. It means, rather, that one should recognize the inherent complexity of all human problems, and the exceedingly great complexity of social problems in particular. It means that one should appreciate the difficulty of taking account, in a theoretical construction, of all elements in the tangled maze of complicating factors—to neglect any one of which may upset one's theoretical predictions. It means above all that, wherever possible, radical proposals should be subjected to controlled experimental test before being put into effect on a wide scale.

There are certain of these complicating factors that do not seem to have the place that they deserve in our current discussions of the curriculum problem. I may be permitted to discuss briefly three of them.

1. The first may be considered by some, perhaps, as not intrinsic to a really fundamental consideration of the curriculum problem. I refer to the very great mobility of the population in the United States. To my mind, this constitutes a complicating factor of large magnitude, and for two reasons: (a) the relatively small chance that a person schooled in one community will continue as a resident of that community during his adult life; and (b) the breaking of the continuity of schooling for literally millions of children.

(a) The first of these factors suggests the unwisdom of adjusting the elementary curriculum in a large way to what we fre-

quently refer to as the "needs of the local community," and the very great importance of determining the needs that are common to American citizens wherever they may dwell. The serious students of rural education, for example, have quite generally rejected the theory that the rural elementary school should aim to "keep children on the farm." It is clear enough now that the city-ward movement of the rural population has been determined largely by fundamental economic forces. Most of the students of rural education believe that every effort should be made to interpret the rural environment to rural pupils and to use the materials of the rural environment in an illustrative way in teaching the more general lessons of the school; but they are not in favor of basing the curriculum for the rural schools on the assumption that the pupils must be retained in agricultural pursuits.

The same general principle should doubtless govern the relationships between the elementary curriculum and the local community everywhere. In so far as the activities and resources of the community are typical of conditions that one will be likely to meet generally throughout the country, they afford a legitimate and valuable means of vivifying instruction and of giving point and meaning to the more generally valuable materials. To assume, however, that the specialized needs of the local community are the paramount concern in curriculum-building is unwarranted.

(b) The effect of the mobility of the population on the continuity of education in the mobile pupil-group is a factor of prime importance in the determination of curriculum policies. The California Curriculum Study revealed a high correlation between overage and mobility. Through an investigation of the causes of failure in the elementary school, the same study also demonstrated clearly the handicaps that pupils encounter when they move from one community to another. If but relatively few pupils were subjected to these handicaps, the mobility-factor might possibly be disregarded in determining curriculum policies. But when, as in California, more than two-thirds of the children attend school in two or more communities during the first eight years of school life, when nearly one-half attend school in three or more communities, and when one-fourth of them attend school in four or more communities, the problem demands serious recognition. While the mobility-index is doubtless higher in California than in most of the states, there are

good reasons to believe that it is sufficiently high throughout the country to make it a complicating factor of large magnitude. Furthermore, every sign of the times points to an increasing, rather than a diminishing, mobility.

Clearly indicated here is the need for a reasonable degree of uniformity in the grade-placement of the *crucial* subjects and topics of the elementary-school curriculum. Investigation has demonstrated that the crucial subjects are those that we have already referred to as the "fundamentals." It is in connection with one or more of these subjects that failure of promotion is almost always associated. Within each of these subjects are certain crucial topics —that is, either items of knowledge or skill, a mastery of which is essential to further progress, or groups of materials, an ignorance of which will leave serious gaps in the citizen's equipment. Variations in the grade-placement of these topics constitute a serious handicap to the mobile pupil-group and in themselves serve no useful end, unless they are so controlled as to form the basis of a real experiment. As a matter of fact, such variations seem generally to be matters of individual whim on the part of local curriculum-builders. It should not be impossible to determine, through carefully controlled objective studies, the most favorable grade-placement of these crucial topics. Indeed, promising beginnings have already been made in this direction. Once the evidence is clearly set forth, it is altogether likely that the essential degree of uniformity would be attained through the voluntary coöperation of state and local school systems throughout the country.

What has just been said is obviously an argument for a 'core' curriculum that will be the nucleus of a common culture for the children of the nation. In the preceding discussion the need for such a curriculum has been urged by reference to a very practical consideration—namely, the interests of the mobile pupil-groups. There is, of course, a far more fundamental justification for urging this policy. Many years ago, the present writer emphasized social integration as a basic function of the elementary school, and at that time set forth the significance of an abundance of common elements which would serve as "social binders" in the education of "all the children of all the people." It is gratifying to note that this fundamental postulate finds emphatic confirmation in the statement of

general principles upon which the contributors to this volume are agreed.

2. A second complicating factor in curriculum building concerns the learning capacities of children rather than the needs of society. In so far as the fundamental school subjects are concerned, there seem to be quite definite limits as to the number of different types of mastery that can be successfully prosecuted at any one time, especially in the earlier school years. Reference has already been made to the growing practice of concentrating upon reading and oral language in the first grade and upon reading, oral language, and writing in the second grade. In the schools that have adopted this policy, the number work in the first two grades is informal in character, and limited chiefly to meeting the simple number-needs that arise in connection with the other activities. The formal and systematic work in arithmetic is thus postponed to the third grade, when, with the initial reading and writing skills fairly well in hand, arithmetic can be made a subject of major importance.

Curriculum-evolution in the remaining grades of the elementary school reveals similar tendencies. Geography, introduced very informally and concretely in the third grade, is given a more significant setting in the fourth grade, but does not become a subject of major importance until the fifth and sixth school years have been reached and in these years geography reaches its peak of importance. In general, the efforts to make history, as such, a major subject in the intermediate grades have not been thoroughly successful. A simple treatment of American history is found in fifth-grade programs, and a more ambitious treatment of the European background of American history is being attempted in the sixth grade. History is clearly recognized as a major subject in the seventh and eighth grades, however. The formal study of the structure and functions of language-forms is now very generally regarded as unwise below the seventh grade, and even here, as was suggested earlier, the prevailing tendency is to limit this study to those topics that can be shown to have a positive effect upon speech habits.

These trends in curriculum-evolution were pointed out in the report of the Illinois School Survey ten years ago. They are confirmed by more recent investigations. In so far as scientific investi-

gation has touched the problem, the evidence suggests that the trends in question have been in the direction of progress. In the present writer's judgment, certain corollaries follow from these findings:

(a) A stated curriculum for the elementary school should distinguish clearly between the subjects or activities that are of major importance in each grade and the subjects and activities which, for the grade in question, are ancillary, or accessory, rather than central and fundamental.

(b) Every effort should be made so to organize the accessory subjects and activities that they will contribute to the mastery of the major subjects. Only in this way can congestion be avoided, together with the consequent diffusion of energy and failure to concentrate. In providing for an enrichment of the elementary-school curriculum, it is especially necessary to guard against the evils of a congested curriculum. In so far as possible, the enriching materials should be clustered around the major 'core' subjects, which thus serve as centers of integration.

3. A third complicating factor to be considered especially in curriculum-revision is the attitude of the public toward the elementary school and toward proposed changes in the curriculum.

It is essential here to distinguish clearly between a general consensus of public opinion and the expressed desires of minority groups interested in this, that, or the other social reform which they hope to promote through the powerful forces of universal education. Recent investigations have clearly shown that these minority groups have been a most important factor in determining curriculum legislation. Through the pressure of organized minorities, subjects of study have been forced into the schools to such an extent in some states as to make the elementary curriculum a veritable hodge-podge of unrelated materials. In other instances, the devotion of special 'days' or 'weeks' to various causes at the behest of earnest advocates of the causes in question has led to a marked interference with the legitimate work of the school.

There is every reason for the profession of teaching to protest against such intrusions and encroachments. At the same time, to question the inherent right of the people to pass judgment upon the aims that their schools are attempting to realize is scarcely democratic, to say the least. Where such judgments represent a

true consensus of public opinion, they must certainly be taken into account. In so far as such a consensus is available (as, for example, in Oregon and California) the outstanding wishes of the people are well worth the consideration of those who are attempting the complicated task of curriculum-revision. A few suggestions are here made with a fair degree of confidence that they do not misrepresent the attitude of the general public:

(a) The people as a whole have little sympathy with efforts to exploit the schools in the interest of miscellaneous social reforms advocated by organized minority groups.

(b) It is the general consensus of intelligent public opinion that the elementary school is attempting to do too many things, and that the present need is for a simplification of curriculum-materials, rather than for additions that would augment the present congestion and complexity.

(c) The general public has a very high regard for literacy, both numerical and linguistic. This, of course, is only a 'highbrow' method of saying that the general public desires, first of all, that the elementary school teach the three R's passing well. It may be added that the adult world apparently retains a firm faith in certain one-time virtues now generally discredited by our profession—notably "thoroughness" and "discipline" (both mental and moral).

From what has just been said, it would be reasonable to infer that the public finds it difficult to understand many of the current proposals for educational reform and the promotion of educational progress.

In making these statements, I do not wish to imply that the public is right in its judgments. The point is that public opinion must be reckoned with, and under these conditions it is certainly well to know what sincere efforts to gauge public opinion actually reveal. In varying degrees the public is both satisfied and dissatisfied with its school. One might be tempted to capitalize the elements of dissatisfaction by maintaining that a complete and radical revision of the elementary curriculum is needed. Such a policy may be needed, but it is not demanded by the public. On the contrary, the advocates of such revision must sooner or later convince the public that they are right if their hopes are to be realized. If there is a recognizable public demand, it is not at all for what the profession regards as "progressive" reforms. It is rather for simpli-

fication and for an emphasis upon materials and processes in which the profession has pretty largely lost its faith. Under such conditions, the policy called for is what the politicians term a "campaign of education."

An important question, as yet unanswered either by the teaching profession or by the public, is the degree of autonomy that the profession may rightfully assume in determining curriculum-policies. One principle, however, is clear enough: whatever measure of freedom is either assumed by, or granted to, the profession must be paralleled by a corresponding measure of responsibility. If the profession assumes full responsibility for policies and practices, it must assume full responsibility for the results. Here, at any rate, the public has an incontestable right to pass judgment.

In this connection, it may not be amiss to emphasize the present-day status of the educational expert. Here America presents a unique situation. In no other country are the professional students of education so influential. In no other country is school practice so quickly responsive to the suggestions emanating from this group. We may stigmatize our schools as "static," "reactionary," "slow to change,"—reluctant to adopt what we, in our wisdom, prescribe. But compared with other countries, ours is the educational expert's paradise.

It would seem, then, that the educational expert, because he influences practice quickly and profoundly, must bear an especially heavy share of the responsibility for the outcomes of American education. These outcomes are ultimately to be observed and measured not in the school, but the world outside the school.

In this connection, it is important, I believe, to study carefully the social situation as it exists to-day in our country in order to determine, first, the elements of strength and weakness in the body-politic and, secondly, the means through which universal education may augment the former and correct the latter. It may also be possible through such a study to evaluate with some measure of justice the ideals that have determined educational policies during the past generation.

It is the disquieting features of the present social situation that demand the first and closest scrutiny, because they seem either to have been almost completely overlooked in our current discussions of educational theory or, if recognized, to have been treated without

reference to the situation in other countries. Among such disquieting features, I would emphasize the following:

(a) The wide prevalence of serious crime in the United States and the apparent increase in crime-ratios during a generation marked by decreasing crime-ratios in practically all comparable nations.

(b) An apparent spread of the spirit of intolerance, both religious and racial.

(c) The continued and apparently increasing dominance of our national philosophy by materialistic, and especially 'commercialistic,' ideals and standards.

(d) The apparent probability that, in proportion to our population, we are not producing our share of creative talent in any field except those concerned primarily with material production and industrial development.

(e) The growth (since 1920) of a narrow type of Americanism, which is expressed most unfortunately in our present attitude toward Europe.

Of these, the first—the crime situation—is of the most immediate seriousness, and the almost complete absence of any reference to it in educational discussions is difficult to understand. The decreasing average age of the criminal population, the increased criminality of the second generation of the immigrant population as compared with the immigrants themselves, the fact that the convicts in Federal prisons have a much higher average of schooling than the general population and that the convicts in typical state prisons are probably not below this average: these, together with the wide prevalence and apparent increase in crime, would seem to demand a very serious consideration in the educational world.

The growing spirit of intolerance is particularly disappointing to those of us who are engaged in the work of education. If, with the growth and extension of education during the past generation, our people have actually become, not only more intolerant than their predecessors, but also more intolerant than are the people of other enlightened nations, then something in the nature of an educational reform would seem to be indicated. There is here less definite proof that the situation is growing worse than we have in connection with the crime situation. I am basing my statements in

part upon my own observations both at home and abroad, and it is my conviction that both religious and racial intolerance have been intensified within the past decade among certain very significant segments of our population.

That we are not producing our quota of creative talent except in the financial and industrial fields will probably not be seriously denied, although the exception that I have named may sufficiently explain the phenomenon. In other words, the opportunities offered by these fields are possibly so alluring as to outbid the less materialistic types of human endeavor for anything except relatively mediocre ability.

Even if this be the explanation, however, it does not make the educational problem any the less acute. The ideals of material prosperity have apparently become deeply imbedded in the mores of our people. Is it possible for education to set up competing ideals that may in time be worked over into competing mores?

It is my conviction that these are examples of the problems that must be faced squarely by our profession and especially by our educational experts, who, as I have suggested, are in a peculiarly strategic position, at least to get educational programs before the profession and ultimately before the people. We are beyond all comparison the richest nation on earth. In so far as actual time spent in school is concerned, our younger generations have had educational opportunities unparalleled by the corresponding generations of other countries. And yet we are by far the most lawless of enlightened peoples, our lawlessness has apparently increased by staggering proportions within a generation, and it is fairly concentrated in our younger generations. Religious and racial intolerance seems to have increased in an analogous fashion. Our output of creative work is not proportionate to our educational investment, if we compare ourselves with other nations. And above all, a certain spirit of selfishness and self-seeking seems not only to dominate individuals and groups, but also to dictate a national policy in world relationships, which even the most sluggish imagination ought to visualize as charged with the gravest peril for our children and our children's children.

I am not at all certain whether these problems are predominantly curriculum problems. The more inclusive ideals of education are

obviously involved, if we consider the problems as in any way educational in their implications. But it is also true that these more inclusive ideals work themselves out in part through curriculum-organization and curriculum-materials. It is certainly pertinent to ask whether the aims and ideals that have increasingly dominated American education during the past generation have had any share in compounding the social conditions which these problems reveal. It is also pertinent to inquire of every proposed change in the curriculum: "Will this change work toward the correction of these unfortunate conditions or will it play still further into the hands of our particular *Zeitgeist* and tend to make matters worse instead of better?"

CHAPTER III

THE ORIENTATION OF THE CURRICULUM-MAKER[1]

FRANKLIN BOBBITT
Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

In approaching the problem of curriculum-making, one must in the beginning distinguish clearly between *general education* and *occupational education*. As a human being, one engages in a great variety of activities. While they differ endlessly in their details, yet, stated in general terms, they are much the same for all properly educated individuals. This education along lines common to most or all normal persons, we call "general education." To this, the elementary school devotes its entire time, the junior high school practically all of its time, and the senior high school, under usual conditions, more than three-quarters of its time.

Against this general education of human beings as such, there is the specialized training for efficiency in performing the activities of some occupation. Each occupation demands its separate and special curriculum. For the occupational training, there must be as many curricula as occupations for which the training is given.

The composite statement of the Committee on "The Foundations of Curriculum-Making" relates to the formulation of a curriculum of general education, except for two or three paragraphs where the occupational side of the work is specifically referred to. All statements in the present chapter, therefore, relate to general education except when the vocational is definitely specified.

Education is for the social purpose of elevating the character of human conduct above what it would otherwise be.

This conduct, which is to be elevated in character, is in part child conduct; in part it is the conduct of youth; and in part it is that of mature men and women. Life is to be so lived at all ages or levels that it is diversified and wholesome, abundant and fruitful. The task of education is to assist childhood, youth, and adulthood

[1] Professor Bobbitt has expressed his general acquiescence in the General Statement. By previous arrangement, however, he did not take part in the deliberations of the Committee.—H.R.

to hold to levels of performance of their activities which are high for the age in question.

The all-inclusive objective of education is *to hold high at all times and ages the quality of human living.* This central objective is the same for infants, children, youths, and adults, though the details of high-grade living will differ according to the degree of maturity.

Holding consciously, voluntarily, and consistently to the quality of activities which constitute high-grade living for one's age is a matter for twenty-four hours each day, seven days each week, and all the weeks of the year. The best portion of the training in holding to activities of this quality comes from performing those activities which are self-initiated, self-planned, and self-managed, without any immediate direction or assistance by teachers or parents.

The schools are to assist children and youths in their current endeavors to hold to the activities of high-grade living. During the five hours in school each day, the child or youth is given the assistance necessary for self-direction in holding his activities to a proper level during the other nineteen hours of the day while out of school. During the twenty-five hours in school per week he is given that assistance which will enable him to hold his activities to a proper level during the 140 hours or so of the week while he is outside of school.

Life is lived in the moving present. It is to be guided in the present. It is to be held high in the present. The life that is being currently lived is the life that is to be shaped. Since it exists only in the present, it can be shaped only in the present. Education is directly concerned only with the moving present; with anything else, only by way of assisting in holding high the day-by-day life-activities of the growing individual.

Teachers, parents, children, and youths, must look to the entire seventy-year life-series of high-grade activities properly to appreciate and understand what is good and wholesome for any one of the age-levels. While the task of education is, therefore, holding education high continuously in the moving present, yet its vision will transcend this present *for the sake of guidance.*

Looking to the entire life-continuum for guidance in upholding the activities of the present does not demand that the present be

merely a preparation for the future. At no time and in no degree is the present to be sacrificed for the future. We do not look forward to the future for the sake of preparing for it; but only for assistance in holding high the current living.

Education is not primarily to prepare for life at some future time. Quite the reverse; it purposes to hold high the current living, making it wholesome, intense, abundant, fruitful, and fitting it firmly into the grooves of habit. Only thus can high-grade living be given that momentum that will carry it through to the end. Then, as the momentum of worthy living carries the process forward day after day, and year after year, the future is cared for automatically and without taking thought. Let us hold high day by day and week by week the moving present, and then as we reach the future we shall find that the activities at that time will be of the same high-grade type. The *momentum* gained from holding the present high *is* the preparation for the future.

In a very true sense, life can not be "prepared for." It can only be lived. But fortunately, living it provides the momentum which continues it on the same level. Living it in proper ways impels it forward along the lines desired by education, and nothing else will do so. Preparation for life is thus a by-product of life itself.

The current activities of high-grade living twenty-four hours each day, and seven days each week *are* the curriculum. For convenience, economy, and effectiveness some of them will be provided for at the school. But in the nature of the case, most of them must be performed elsewhere. The school must therefore project its influence and guidance through the six or eight hours while the pupil is out of school for each of his hours in school.

Education thus has a double task. On the one hand, it is to provide, to condition, and to guide activities of many wholesome kinds at the school. But more important, it is to provide for a continuance of high-grade activity on the part of the individual during all of the hours when he is outside of the school.

The self-directed out-of-school activities appear to be the ones which are most influential in shaping character and conduct. If the school is so operating that its labors result in lifting this outside conduct above what it would otherwise be, then to that degree

the school is successful in educating. To the degree, however, in which the labors of the school do not result in lifting the outside conduct above that which it would otherwise be, then the school is failing to educate.

A school is not primarily an assemblage of classes where subjects are being taught. It is a place where the growing human beings of the community assemble for some portion of their current wholesome living, and a place for getting advice, guidance, and stimulation for a continuance of that wholesome diversified living for all the rest of the time.

We have no difficulty in viewing adult life as a *system of activities* in which are realized the ends of human existence. We do not conceive adult life in terms of subjects. Now equally, it is possible for us to see juvenile life in terms of activities. No more than in the case of the adult, when juvenile life is normal, is it a matter of memorizing subjects. The memorizing of subjects has become for the younger generation largely a substitute for life and therefore a substitute for education. For both life and education it is a poor and ineffective substitute. Of course, subjects can not be managed at their worst without some life filtering in; and this does provide for a certain amount of education. But relative to what is possible, the results are meager.

The curriculum-maker will find the entire range of fruitful activities which ought to make up human existence on each of the age-levels. The task is first to find those individuals of a particular age-level who have been most successful in performing the activities desirable for that age-level—and possibly for each ability-level as well. With this successful group before him, the task is the simple one of listing the activities performed and noting the character or quality of the performance. The activity-analyst will be more concerned with subjective activities than the visible objective ones. While he will concern himself with activities of health, citizenship, social communication, human association, recreation, and a number of others in their objective aspects, yet even in connection with these activities he will be more concerned with the activities of intellectual vision, valuation, judgment, planning, decision, and the other things out of which one's objective activities spring. But as those that take precedence over the narrowly utilitarian, he will be

particularly careful not to omit the peculiarly humanistic activities, such as one's intellectual vision, one's aesthetic emotional reactions, one's meditations, one's religious contemplations, one's longings and aspirations and the other mental activities which are so easily overlooked by the myopic type of activity-analyst.

When the central objective of education is nothing other than continuously holding to the activities of high-grade living, and when the specific objectives are none other than these specific activities, then the educative process can be stated in very simple terms: Let child and youth at each age perform the activities which constitute high-grade living for that age. Let life be full and abundant for its own sake and education is automatically taken care of.

We should be careful to emphasize and not to obscure the great simplicity of the educative process. If the curriculum-maker can hold to this single principle, it will provide the educational theory for solving most of his problems.

But over against this simplicity of the educative process, it must be noted that life itself is complex beyond all description. The situations are infinitely diverse and never the same for any two individuals. The compelling influences are innumerable and endlessly subtle. Because of this complexity of life itself, our profession will find it no easy matter to guide the simple educative process. But we should ever bear in mind that it is life which is complex and not the central educative process.

It thus appears that the educational objectives and the educational processes are one and the same thing. The process of continuous right living in the present is the process of rightly preparing to live in the future. Whether any given activity be viewed as objective or as process is all a matter of the relations in which it is viewed.

Life is an individual affair. It is the response of the individual himself, as conditioned by his particular nature, to the situations which provide him with opportunities and stimulations. No two persons can have identical natures, and the disparities among persons are far greater than education has yet cared to recognize. And yet the differences in original nature are not the major reasons why life must be an individual affair. This individuality is pro-

duced rather more by the differing sequence of situations within which each individual finds himself. No two persons can be confronted with an identical series of situations, especially during that major portion of time spent at home and within the general community life. No two persons can have an identical sequence of moods, wishes, intentions, awakened desires, impelling surges of ambition, likes and dislikes, loves and hates, attractions and repulsions, and the thousand motivating influences which vitalize and impel the current sequence of the individual's activities. For fullest self-realization, therefore, each must live his own life according to his nature and the sequence of situations within which he finds himself. The life of child and youth can not be planned by educational authorities, uniformly and mechanically, for a multitude of children and youths at the same time, and the plans then imposed equally and mechanically upon all. This cannot be done even at school. But the major responsibility of education is so to project its influences that life is held high during the hours when one is away from the school. In its details life can scarcely be planned at all except as it is planned currently and for the individual himself. In chief measure it appears it must be planned *by* the individual himself. Each person, it seems, must have his own curriculum. He may need much assistance, guidance, oversight, and stimulation; and yet it appears that, except for very little children, and largely even for them, one must plan for one's self.

We meet here with a problem of enormous complexity which has yet been discussed but little by the educational profession. It is felt by most individuals that the adult should be entirely free to plan and live his own life so long as he does not override the rights of others; that life should not be planned for him and imposed upon him by someone else. There is considerable uncertainty as to where the line should be drawn between activities which are socially harmful and those socially harmless, and there are certain zealous groups at present who appear to deny the principle even of adult freedom. In general, however, we believe that the adult has the right of self-planned, self-directed realization of life's opportunities. But does this apply to childhood and to youth? To what extent have parents and child a right of themselves to decide the nature of the life of

the child which is to be currently lived? A uniform curriculum, mechanically imposed upon all boys and girls of whatever situation, is, so far as it is effective, a clear denial of the right of the individual to initiate plans and carry through activities in which he can most fully realize currently the ends of his existence.

In suggesting the possibility of this freedom, we fully recognize the need of the guidance of children and youths by teachers, parents, nurses, librarians, family pastors, and their own juvenile friends and associates. We are not assuming a condition of irresponsibility. We are assuming that it is possible to have both freedom and responsibility; that, indeed, we can properly have neither without the other.

The present writer believes that education should be administered with a view to giving individuals of whatever age the greatest possible amount of individual freedom, so long as this freedom is accompanied by sense of responsibility; that curriculum-making is mainly concerned with the making of the *individual curriculum* for the individual boy or girl, by himself, or herself, as guided by teacher and parents.

But everybody concerned in planning the individual curriculum is in need of general guidance. One needs to know in a general way what the activities are which are involved in the care of human health, in the discharge of one's responsibilities as a citizen, in wholesome recreation, in the unspecialized practical arts, in one's language, one's vision of human affairs, and all of the other activities which constitute high-grade living. It is difficult to hold all of these things in mind. In their details for the many age-levels, it is clearly impossible for one to remember them all. One needs, therefore, a general statement of the activities of good type which are desirable for each of the successive age levels, and for individuals of different natural capacity and special aptitudes. Thus, we need a general statement of the curriculum, in outlines so broad that it will be applicable to any normal individual. Such a statement cannot be reduced to details. Neither can it indicate the quality of the activity that is to be achieved, since this quality must differ endlessly for different individuals. It can, however, show the *lines* of desirable activity and it can show the *scale* of possible quality for each of the lines. The individual curriculum-maker, then, whether

he be pupil or teacher or parent, can use the general statement in deciding upon lines, and levels of quality, to be achieved.

Our profession, it appears, should distinguish very clearly between the *individual curriculum* and the *general curriculum*. A curriculum-making committee, in formulating a manual which is to be printed, is concerned only with the general curriculum. It is only for assistance to those who need such assistance. It is not a thing to be prescribed or imposed upon children and youths—except in so far as we deny, for the juvenile generation, doctrines of freedom under social guidance.

In discussing the technique of curriculum-planning, we would specially insist upon the desirability of distinguishing between the general curriculum designed for all within a system and the individual curriculum designed for the single growing individual, and of always making clear to the reader which of these two types of curricula is being discussed. For the technique of planning the individual curriculum is a quite different thing from that of planning the general curriculum.

The technique of curriculum-making discussed in the report of the Committee is presumed to relate to the formulation of that general curriculum which can be put into printed form; and yet much of the composite statement is prepared with a view also of the needs of individuals as such. The technique which it presents is in the main applicable to the formulation of the general curriculum. The much more important technique of formulating the individual curriculum was not undertaken by the Committee. From the point of view of the present writer, this is the outstanding deficiency of the general report, as regards technique.

The curriculum-maker of to-day, it appears, should clearly distinguish between the old archaic 'storage' conception of education and the modern behavioristic conception. In the foregoing paragraphs, I have assumed the latter conception. Education is not a matter of storing up information and skills against some day of need far in the future, but rather a matter of practicing currently the forms of high-grade behavior, to the end that life be realized currently and given that momentum which will continue similarly wholesome self-realization through the future years. We have assumed that education is mainly not a matter of consciously and

systematically teaching subject matter, in the good old sense, but rather a matter of living in an all-sided way and learning to live through the living.

The first step in modern curriculum-making is to formulate a statement of the activities which constitute a proper quality of human living. These are the objectives. They are the processes. They are the curriculum. They can be stated in very general form in a single paragraph; in less general form in a page or two; in more specific form in twenty pages; in quite detailed form, for the successive age-levels, in several hundred pages.

Whatever the degree of generality employed, the statement of the activities quite obviously should be a balanced one. It should neglect no form of wholesome activity, and it should emphasize none unduly.

The balanced program of activities, it seems, must be formulated by those who have a balanced, or proportioned, vision of human affairs. It should represent the vision of the generalist in education as a whole, not the specialist in some particular line of it. It cannot be a composite, resulting from the always futile attempt to amalgamate the partial views of intensive specialists.

One who would plan a behavioristic curriculum must divest himself of all of the 'storage' conception. He should not use the terminology of storage education in formulating education for behavior. He should not attempt the camouflage of the ancient vocabulary in order to present modern conceptions. If he does not see that these latter are dictated by science, which needs no camouflage, then he is not prepared for a modern type of curriculum-making. The two conceptions are so antagonistic that they can not be fused into a hybrid plan of education.

The plan of education toward which the profession moves is concerned, not primarily with *knowledge,* but with *activity.* Instead of knowledge of textbook sort, as we have conceived it there should be subjective activities which are continuous, vigorous, diversified, abundant, and fruitful. They should be the constituents of high-grade intellectual living. Intellectual life of proper type is not an engulfing and a nursing within one's self of inert unassimilated bodies of knowledge.

There is need of an enormous amount of careful scientific investigation by way of discovering what constitutes a high type of

human living for each age-level and for the several ability-types at each of these ages. And yet this scientific investigation should be simply a matter of making accurate that vision of wholesome and fruitful living which every competent teacher has, or should have, as the result of his own years of experience and of observation. Since comprehensive vision of the good life is the substance of our fundamental educational science, the application of scientific technique is merely to make this observation as accurate as practicable.

There should be no mystification of the profession by the specialists in scientific technique. Teachers and supervisors should know with certainty that the investigative results relate not to the major things, but only to the details, each of which is relatively minor as compared to the fundamentals of the educational science. Teachers should not be made to feel that the science which should guide education is mainly esoteric and entrusted only to the investigative elect. Quite the reverse, they should be made to know that every competent teacher can have a full command over the fundamental educational science, and that he must have it in order that he be competent. They should know that it is so much a matter of common-sense and general human vision that *in the fundamentals* they can be authorities as completely as the investigative specialist. In this matter, the self-confidence of teachers is to be encouraged and not discouraged.

In our educational science of the present there is great need of simplicity and directness. All fundamental truths can be stated simply. Only when one is dealing with the relatively superficial details must one run to many words.

At present, our profession above all things needs a clear vision of the fundamentals. It would be wholesome beyond expression if in our discussions of education we could for a time hold only to that science which is so fundamental that it can be stated quite simply.

For stating our fundamental educational science, there is at present a great need of an appropriate vocabulary. We suggest not a standardization of some special vocabulary, but rather a sincere attempt to express education in the vocabulary of that everyday living which after all is the substance of anyone's education. The simple vocabulary of common sense is at present best for our purposes.

In presenting the fundamentals of education, it appears advisable to avoid the schoolroom point of view. It seems that it should be from the point of view of the seventy-year continuum of normal living. The point of view that we take greatly affects the character both of our ideas and of our expression.

The need of universalizing the science among teachers—and as far as practicable among parents—is due to the individualizing of the curriculum. The storage conception of education calls for a mechanical technique and assumes a relative uniformity in the natures and situations of the children and youths. It has been able, therefore, to employ a uniform curriculum, the same for all. This could be made out by some central official or committee. Teachers in general need not be concerned in the matter. But as education becomes behavioristic, there is a call for the planning of those activities which constitute the individual lives of children, living within individual families. These life-plans cannot be handed down from some central authority and imposed equally upon all. They must be currently planned by pupil, teacher, and parents. These individuals need the guidance which comes from the fundamentals of educational science, set forth in terms that all can understand.

The major curriculum-makers of modern education—when we can get it modernized—will be those who are planning the *individual* curriculums of the children and youths entrusted to their care. The generalizing of these individual curriculums in the formulation of a general curriculum is but an incidental afterresult. The quality of the general curriculum will be dependent upon the qualities of the several individual curricula which are generalized.

Shall the curriculum be made currently or long in advance? Quite obviously, the individual curriculum can only be made currently. And this, by the way, is the only kind of actual curriculum which should be planned. What we have here called the "general curriculum" is but the formulation of the general outlines of the educational science which is to be employed in the planning of the actual curriculums for the individuals. It is like the chart employed with profit by the master mariner. The chart may be prepared long in advance, and used over and over again; but each

course in its details must be managed according to the conditions met with at the time.

A good general curriculum may be made for the nation as a whole and employed with profit in any state or city. It may be made by the educational authorities of the state, and employed in any portion of that state, whether urban or rural. It may be formulated by the central authorities in a city and employed in all of the schools of that city. But whatever the type, it is only a general chart which is employed by those who are actually planning the curricula as they guide education. It is not a thing that can properly be imposed upon those who should be the authorities in the education of any given child by virtue of the fact that they best know him and his actual situation.

Those who participate in the formulation of the general curriculum should be primarily specialists in life itself, and not specialists in any special subject. They should be primarily generalists in education and not specialists in some portion of it.

That the general curriculum is not to be made or planned by subjects, it seems should go without the saying. The continuous, diversified, and abundant intellectual life which is desirable is not mainly a matter of learning subjects.

Thus far, national committees of subject-specialists have in the main made but meager contributions to the modernization of their departments. Their vision appears to be so completely confined to their particular subjects that they are mostly unable to get out of the deep ruts of the storage conception. Where exceptions are found, it is to be noted that the committee has succeeded in taking the general human behavior point of view first of all and then viewing their responsibility in terms of that general behavior.

Curriculum-planning is not to assume that the educational world is made up only of specialists in particular subjects or lines and that the educational generalist does not exist, and ought not to exist. It is not to assume that all we have to work with is a series of partial insights and that the technique of curriculum-making is mainly a technique of compromise. Quite the reverse: we need the technique of the comprehensive balanced vision. It is as necessary to have the technique of the generalist as to have that of the specialist. The latter has a vital responsibility to discharge. But no number of them can do the work of the generalist.

The present writer believes that teacher-training institutions should prepare teachers for a modern type of *education for behavior,* and not for a continuance of storage education. And not for a hybrid. Let us suppose that medical science has discovered a new and effective mode of combatting some particular disease; and that the practitioners out in the field are using an antiquated and ineffective method of dealing with the same disease. Shall the medical school then train their students both in the old inefficient methods and also in the new efficient method? Or shall they train the young practitioners only in the method sanctioned by science itself? As a matter of fact, medicine has faith in its science. It teaches only the methods sanctioned by science, whether the old practitioners in the field are using those methods or not. Those who are training teachers have need of an analogous confidence in the dictates of educational science. They should not be intimidated into training for what they know to be inferior practice.

"But school boards will not then hire our graduates," they say. It is to be noted that the modern scientific medical practitioner is to be preferred to the antiquated one. His welfare was not neglected by modernizing him. Why cannot education be equally safe in thoroughly modernizing its professional personnel?

In behavioristic education, the curriculum-planner is not greatly concerned with time-units. He is assisting the individual at all times to hold to high-grade living, both at school and away from school, both during school days and after school days are ended. He sees life as organic and continuous, and does not see it broken into terms, semesters, and academic years. He is concerned, however, with the distribution of the weekly time of children and youths. It is obvious that if there is to be a proper variety, diversification, and amount of each kind of activity that the time should be properly distributed among the many possibilities. The individual should not live a narrowed life simply by specializing in certain of the possibilities to the exclusion of other desirable ones.

The test of the school portion of the curriculum is the quality of the living which results from the school's projecting its influence through the 140 hours of time per week outside of the school. Naturally, this is not the test of certain activities which can take place only at the school itself. But it certainly applies to most of one's activities. It should be noted that examinations and stand-

ardized tests are for the most part portions of the technique of the archaic system of storage education. As usually constituted, they do not measure the efficacy of a behavioristic curriculum.

It is probable that the greatest failure of schools at present results from so organizing the training as to expect practically all of education to be accomplished during the 25 hours per week at school and from its failure or refusal to organize for the purpose of projecting its influence through the 140 hours per week outside of the school. To be satisfied with 25 hours of irrelevant and futile efforts at storage, results in overlooking the school's most vital responsibility. To spend the 25 hours per week in an innocuous preparing for the vague, distant, and safe future is simply to overlook the educational responsibility which lies at hand. It is a most surprising oversight.

The school is not an agency of social reform. It is not directly concerned with improving society. Its responsibility is to help the growing individual continuously and consistently to hold to the type of human living which is the best practical one for him. This should automatically result in an enormous improvement in society in general. But this improvement is not a thing directly aimed at. It is only a by-product. If we visualize the conditions of a perfected society wherein further improvement is not possible, the responsibility of education is not changed or diminished thereby.

The statement that "no definite line can be drawn between general and vocational education" appears to result from an adherence to the pure subject-teaching conception of education. It appears to assume that education is merely the teaching of subjects and that, whether we are carrying on general education or vocational education, we are in large measure teaching the same subjects. It follows, then, that they count both ways and the two purposes cannot be disentangled. To one who views education from the two points of view of general behavior and of the specialized behavior of the vocations, the statement appears to have no relation whatever to the realities.

The mere rearrangement of familiar subject matter in the form of general science, general mathematics, and the like, assumes only a continuance of the archaic subject-storage conception of education. These compositing movements, therefore, as such, are really

no part of the modernization of the curriculum. They are merely new ways of doing the old things. Modernization results from building on the new and changed foundations of human behavior. Merely to juggle the arrangement of academic subject matter is to make *changes,* but not necessarily to make progress. It may even be retrogression.

The foregoing statements are designed to show wherein the present writer is in agreement with the "General Statement of the Committee" and wherein he fails to see the things as there presented as he attempts to look at human education wholly from a functional point of view. He believes that the general statement of the Committee is a highly significant contribution to the developing theory of curriculum-making. It seems, however, from the point of view of functional education, it is only a *contribution to progress* and falls short of taking a genuinely functional point of view. It should be noted, however, that this general statement shows great progress over what such a committee would have found possible so recently as three years ago. It is helping to formulate foundations on which some corresponding committee some three years hence can take another equally large step of progress. The present writer can refer the more freely to what seem to him to be merits and demerits since he was present at none of the meetings where it was hammered into its present shape. His signature to the document attests his belief that it represents a significant forward step, but not that it represents in any adequate way those doctrines of functional, or behavioristic, education toward which the profession is clearly moving.

CHAPTER IV

THE CURRICULUM AND CURRICULUM-MAKING

FREDERICK G. BONSER
Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

I. THE GENERAL STATEMENT AS A WHOLE

Since the General Statement to which we have subscribed represents next practicable steps in curriculum-making, it indicates the general direction in which we all believe the movement should go. We all believe that moving in the direction indicated by the steps suggested, means progress toward the more remote or complete purposes of our respective conceptions of life and education. But beyond the steps here agreed upon as giving the proper direction for progress, there may be few steps or many, depending upon one's fundamental conception of life, education, and the curriculum. For me, there are numerous steps to be taken beyond these, before what I believe to be measurably attainable ideals are fully reached.

My Conception of Life and Education

I regard life as made up of activities or behavior (including thought and feeling elements no less than overt action), each element of which is of worth in just the degree that it contributes to social survival. By survival, I mean continuity and length of life. Social or race life is, of course, conditioned by the wholesomeness of individual life. There is no fundamental opposition between the well-being of society and the individual when behavior is measured in terms of the survival-values of society. The individual may, on occasion, have to sacrifice possible immediate satisfactions for the sake of the survival needs of society. But in so doing he is but choosing satisfactions of a higher order rather than a lower—satisfactions resulting from behavior of higher survival-value. What we call "civilization" is, in part, the result of subordinating satisfactions of a low order to a higher.

These survival-values, identical with values for progress toward a condition in which all behavior is for the greatest enrichment of

the race life as far as behavior is within human control, are the sole criteria for judging the quality of conduct in action, thought, and feeling. There is no authority for determining whether behavior—action, thought or feeling—is good or bad, other than the test of its consequences in individual and social life. If it tends to lengthen and strengthen the individual and group life, it is good; if it tends to shorten and weaken life, it is bad. It matters not who said a thing or when it was said, it should be ruled out of consideration absolutely if it will not bear the test of application. Because Ptolemy said the sun moves around the earth gives the statement no value whatever for action or thought control when tested truth shows Ptolemy to be wrong. It is not because Moses said: "Thou shalt not steal," that stealing is wrong, but because we find that stealing is highly injurious to social and individual life. All values for life are derived from life itself—whatever helps is desirable; whatever hinders is undesirable. Interpreted narrowly and without consideration of relative values, this view might be vicious and repulsive. But viewed in the large, in terms of both the whole of individual and social life, it comprehends the highest order of values and makes an appeal for behavior that is good by all of the tests of consequences.

As the race increasingly abandons its dependence upon the authority of both persons and long-practiced customs, except as these bear the tests of scientific investigation or of application in life itself, changes in needs for education follow with a corresponding rapidity. Each new generation maintains increasingly that it should live its own life, derive its own values, and determine its own ideals in correspondence with changes in knowledge, conditions, and needs. And this is right, with the proviso clearly understood that changes in behavior should be justified by testing them and accepting only those proposed which contribute to individual and race well-being—which make for individual and social survival. It should be not only the privilege, but also the obligation, of each generation to learn clearly why the forms of conduct which it adopts are good and why those which it rejects are undesirable. This is the only means by which intelligent self-control can be developed. Every individual should appreciate the relationship between conduct and its consequences. Otherwise, he is a slave to

customs, habits, or attitudes and is without ability to make adjustments to the changing order of life.

In no sense does this mean that the past should be ignored nor that the experience of the race should be disregarded. By painful centuries of trial-and-result procedure the race has tested many forms of conduct and has established many facts, principles, and procedures which stand the tests of continued application. The critical examination of the past should constitute a stabilizing influence in evaluating the practices of the present and any proposed changes in standards and customs. When it is appreciated that "bearing false witness" is just as injurious to social life to-day as it was in the days of Moses, and that "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is just as potent an attitude for social coöperation and solidarity to-day as it was twenty centuries ago, it will tend to impress the fact that change may mean retrogression instead of progress. Change is desirable or justifiable only as it contributes to progress.

Life is properly made up of activities by which individuals and the race strive to get the greatest degree of satisfaction from what has cumulatively been achieved as ways of behaving, and to add new ways which contribute still further to its enrichment and prolongation. Knowledge, habits, skills, attitudes, and appreciations are all elements of behavior control, and they may also be used as means of behavior improvement. All of these factors are of worth in just the measure that they contribute to meet the needs of life for economic, social, political, intellectual, recreational, and religious satisfactions. Social ideals—the ideals which represent the well-being of the race life—make service, or social usefulness, the source of the highest form of satisfaction.

One's conception of life conditions his conception of education, and the two condition his conception of the curriculum. From this conception of life, education is interpreted as a process of experiencing, by which one learns to participate in life activities with increasing efficiency and satisfaction. Since social life is the all-inclusive ideal, satisfaction is measured in terms of social purposes, means, and methods. Learning thus becomes the process of participating in socially valuable experiences—valuable because through them the purposes, means, and methods of living are de-

veloped. The purposes, meanings, and values of activities are learned; the use of the knowledge found to help in making the experiences most successful is learned; the habits, skills, and procedures, individual and coöperative, necessary to efficient participation are learned; the methods of making desirable and successful changes are learned; and the emotional responses—the attitudes and appreciations—most wholesome for enjoyment and control are learned. In appropriate experiences these several elements of learning all take place more or less simultaneously. When one element is dominant or focal, the others are more or less marginal. Now one element, now another, may be abstracted and emphasized for a time. Only, however, as this is done to concentrate upon the learning of the particular element whose use is realized by the learner to be of significant importance, should any one factor be dissociated from its connection with a situation of which it is a part. If an element of any kind becomes entirely dissociated from its connection with any activity to which it contributes, loses its place in life experience, it tends correspondingly to lose its educational value. To make educative such abstracted elements for purposes of intensive learning, it is certainly clear that they must come out of experiences which give them their meaning and value, and that they must go back into experiences in which they are used.

The school is provided to afford children an opportunity to have those needed social experiences in systematic and orderly ways which are not afforded in normal social life with sufficient frequency or under favorable conditions for economical learning. Necessarily, school life is but one aspect of the child's complete social life. By emphasis upon relationships, it may connect all of the experiences which it affords the learner with the total situations, needs, and purposes of which these experiences are parts. Life and education, then, are coincidental activities, education representing a conscious effort and procedure to increase the abundance of experience and the power of experiencing.

From this conception of life and education, it follows that the curriculum is fundamentally a succession of experiences by which one may learn the ways of life. One learns to do what he has experience in doing. By providing all that one can use of the best known ways of doing, the curriculum may furnish means of making the learning relatively very rapid and very efficient. As contribut-

ing to life experience, knowledge plays an important part. The fundamental importance of thinking as a basis for action can not be overemphasized. Thinking requires a knowledge of facts, principles, and procedures as well as purposes. To think, one must have something to think about—a question or problem—and facts to think with. In the curriculum there must appear no opposition between experiences and the means for conducting these experiences derived from the past. Any curriculum that emphasizes experiences, but neglects to provide sources and make provision for the informational and thinking material needed to make these activities as meaningful and intelligent as we know how, is inadequate and partial. All of the more important questions of to-day require the use of a scientific open mind, free from prejudice, and willing to follow the implications of tested thought wherever it leads. The curriculum should place among its highest objectives the development of methods of critical thinking in all of the experiences which it affords involving selective judgment as a basis of conduct in any of its forms. The curriculum should furnish an abundance of experiences in coöperative enterprises, civic, social, and recreational, providing also for much discussion of points of view and current issues of life with contributory source and thought materials. The curriculum should also provide definitely for the development of habits and skills in all activities in which one can profitably become more or less automatic in his responses. Many experiences should be provided in recreation, and the curriculum should include provision for the development of appreciations and attitudes for desirable recreational activities no less than for social and moral appreciations and attitudes.

Without question, this implies what is now called an "activity curriculum," or a "behavior curriculum." As an ultimate goal, I can see no alternative that is consistent with the foregoing conception of life and education or with pragmatic psychology. But, while the basis of the curriculum is experiences in doing, thinking, and appreciating what people should do, think, and appreciate in normal social life, this does not mean that the experiences may not be arranged in an orderly fashion and be systematic in terms of the learner's methods of mental growth. Neither does the organization on this basis mean the elimination nor the neglect of content—"sub-

ject matter." Ideal organizations of complete curricula made of experiences and contributory materials in relationship to appropriate purposes have not yet been developed, but there is nothing theoretically opposed to the conception and nothing practically impossible in it. It involves a modified technique of teaching, and this technique is gradually evolving. Excellent piecemeal illustrations of this conception have been worked out in many schools. That a whole curriculum can be based upon this conception; that it more nearly approaches the ideal form of curriculum than any other; and that its development is inevitable if we continue to progress in education are convictions which I can not escape. It is in this very direction that I believe the statements of our agreement point. The statements indicate next steps, but there are yet other steps which they do not include. Many points of detail relating to the conception I have presented are suggested in the General Statement to which I shall now refer.

II. Curriculum Construction in the Light of Child Growth and Social Life

More strongly than in the General Statement, I would emphasize the use of the experiences, interests, and needs of the learner. One might organize a curriculum by distributing the content representing the interests, needs, and activities of adult life in the order of their relative difficulty for learning and maintain that this corresponded to the needs, interests, and experiences of the learner in passing from earlier years to later. It is said that one "grows as an individual by appropriating the modes of behavior developed in society." This is true and good if "appropriating" and "modes of behavior" are interpreted broadly enough to include all of the desirable qualities of behavior and not to neglect those that make for independent thinking and self-direction, for efficient coöperation, for developing an inquiring attitude, for making moral judgments, and for learning to adjust to changes in life. The learner is interested in activity, physical and mental. He is very seldom found running around looking for something to learn; rather he is having experiences and he is usually in quest of more experiences. The stimuli to most of his experiences are those of the social life about him, as he is driven by impulses to action, thought, and feeling

from within himself. His satisfactions come from participating in these activities and through them the needs are revealed for that "subject matter" which, if used, would increase his efficiency and satisfaction in the experiences, and also stimulate new interests and open the way to new experiences. The study of child growth provides the basis of the orderly system of curriculum-content in terms of the learner's needs, rather than in terms of the logical completeness of a subject within the limits of its own content as developed by the specialist in adult social life. The learner, if he is really to grow, is not arbitrarily to substitute modes of adult behavior for his own, but rather to develop his methods of acting, thinking, and feeling by utilizing the helpful elements from social behavior as these contribute to the enrichment and efficiency of his own experiences. As he learns, he increasingly approaches adult standards in his modes of living, but with an understanding and appreciation of their meaning that makes for intelligent self-direction, rather than with mere imitative acceptance. There is often made a contrast of child life and social life that seems to imply that the child is outside of social life and must be prepared to enter it as an adult. The learner is already in social life and is participating in it as fully as his capacity and the conditions will permit. The curriculum should provide the means for promoting this participation in a balanced and orderly fashion, just as rapidly as this can be accomplished through normal growth.

III. Curriculum-Making and the Scientific Study of Society

Beyond the General Statement, I would add but a word of emphasis upon the need of directing greater attention to the study of the motives and modes of activity which constitute actual living and which determine very largely the social and moral conduct of both adults and young people. It is, of course, highly desirable to make the teaching and learning of the needed facts and procedures represented by the subjects of study as thoroughly scientific as possible. But it is even more important to search out the purposes, motives, and actuating controls which determine the ways in which people act, think, and feel in life-situations. In political life, social life, occupational life, and recreational life, not only what do people

actually do, but why do they do as they do. What can be done actually to make changes in life for the better in all of these activities from the standpoint of moral values? Adding together measurable efficiencies in reading, spelling, language, number, practical arts, and in the recall of facts of science or the social studies does not seem to result in sound, efficient moral character as a sum. Faith that strength of character for social control would result from such addition does not seem to be justified. There is need for much scientific study of what and how people actually do, think, and feel about the important daily problems and relationships of living, and how these ways of behaving may be directed and controlled for more highly efficient and satisfying results. Unless the curriculum provides means for education that affect the quality of behavior in its moral phases, it is inadequate in its most important function. To neglect the development of character is to neglect all. To a considerable degree, it is consciousness of this need and its neglect that has created the demand for the use of life-experiences rather than partial elements of experience as the units of learning and growth. In our general theory, all else in education is held to be contributory to the development of sound moral character. By scientific study of social behavior and the making of curricula in harmony with the findings of such study we should make this so in fact as well as in theory.

IV. The School as a Conscious Agency for Social Improvement

Can there be any purpose more fundamentally important in education than that of "bringing learners to a progressive understanding of their responsibilities for social progress and of the problems, practices, and institutions of social life?" The General Statement further reads: "Throughout their school careers, pupils should be given opportunities to think about these problems and institutions, to develop attitudes of understanding and tolerance, and to perfect habits of right conduct and creative self-expression." Not only should the curriculum provide specifically for consideration of these social questions, habits, and attitudes, but its whole organization should be such as to involve their significance and meaning at every crucial point. Hitherto, these values have been

largely subordinated to the facts and processes of the subjects of study or even ignored entirely except by an implication that meant nothing in practice. It is to these "problems, practices, and institutions of social life" that the subject matter of the studies should contribute. The experiences to which the subjects of study contribute should, then, be included as parts of the curriculum quite as fully as the contributing material itself. It is this isolation of 'subject matter' from life usage, and the omission from the schools of life activities and problems that logically point to changes which should result in some form of 'activity'curriculum—a curriculum including life-problems, interests, needs, and practices as sources of motives and bases of approach to the related, contributory 'subject matter.' Eventually, that some such an organization of the curriculum will come seems inevitable if the school is to become really an agency for social improvement, as we heartily agree that it should.

V. The Curriculum and Social Integration

In one point only would I add a word to the General Statement. The third long paragraph (No. 22) seems to dwell chiefly upon questions of different levels of ability and of the problems of children of rapid and slow responses, respectively. Perhaps it implies provisions that are adequate for children whose abilities differ in kind, as well as in degree. I agree fully with the purposes and values of social integration set forth. But I recognize such differences in capacities, interests, and needs of children in junior-high-school years as seem to me to require and justify partial differentiation of studies in these years. This does not mean specialization for vocational education and training in these years, but selection among several studies not taken in common to meet the learning needs of individual pupils. Without doubt, considerably more than half of the studies of these years may be taken profitably by pupils in common. But to require all to take full programs of the same studies, even with great flexibility in outcomes accepted as passing standards, would ignore very fundamental facts of individual differences and needs, and of social needs and values as well.

VI. Changing Conceptions of Learning and Subject Matter

In this section of the General Statement lie the conclusions of the Committee which come into most immediate and direct connection with the detailed problems of curriculum-making. This section may be interpreted and applied with a very wide range of differences in degree. I approve it with emphasis and delight, for it sanctions, as I interpret it, all that I have been advocating in foregoing paragraphs. It sanctions the making of a curriculum "in terms of a succession of experiences and enterprises having a maximum of life-likeness for the learner." Also, it maintains the view that: "The method by which the learner works out these experiences, enterprises, exercises, should be such as calls for maximal self-direction, assumption of responsibility, and of exercise of choice in terms of life-values." This does not at all mean cutting loose from the experience of the race, for the statement explicitly says that: "The learner must, in general, as regards any particular problem, conception, or solution of a problem, approximate the most available form of social organization through his own personal mode of assimilation. In helping the learner to reach this approximation, the intelligent teacher will use the methods which have been proved by previous educational experience to be most effective." This provides a program of progress that not only links up directly with conditions as they are, indicating next steps, but also a program that indicates the direction of progress along a straight line far ahead of immediate next steps.

VII. The Teacher's Need for an Outline Planned in Advance

There is need for explicit emphasis that this section should be interpreted as approving an advanced outline of experiences to promote the growth of the learner, and not as a mandate for 'covering so much ground' in terms of subject-matter content in given periods of time. In many current school curricula, growth values are quite subordinated to 'covering ground.' Teachers with good training are often forced to do what they know to be opposed to the most efficient growth of their pupils and to refrain from doing what they know the growth needs of these pupils demand. We yet

know too little about the rates of growth and the adjustment of subject-matter content to the needs of growth to fix in advance the precise number of items a given grade of learners should be required to master in exact time-units. This does not at all mean that no planning in advance is possible, but it does mean that growth in achieving the purposes of educational experiences, and not alone the learning of subject matter, should in very fact be made the basis for the measurement of progress. Many courses of study are so crowded with prescribed textual content to be learned that the teacher has no opportunity to consider the "daily life situations and interests from which the immediate specific needs of students arise," which represents that part of the curriculum that "should be—can only be—made from day to day," as agreed in the General Statement.

As the General Statement points the "progressive demand for specialization and for professional, scientific training and experience" in curriculum-making, so also is there a corresponding need for that training of the teacher which will enable him to make the adjustments of that part of the curriculum made in advance to the situations and conditions of day-to-day needs. The development of an improved, scientific curriculum requires the training of teachers in the appropriate use of such a curriculum.

VIII. The Place of the School Subjects in Instruction

This section clearly recognizes "that the materials of instruction should be assembled from the starting point of the needs of the learner, irrespective of the content and boundaries of existing school subjects." The criterion agreed upon as exercising the greatest control over the organization of the materials of instruction is that of "true learning." Whatever the demands of true learning, I believe the organization of the content of what we call "subjects" will still have the characteristics of order and system, although these may be in terms of growth processes and very different from the organization of the specialist interested in the logical coherence of the elements of the subject from the point of view of completeness. The section sanctions promising variations, and it emphasizes the importance of making such experiments under the guidance of thoroughly scientific conditions so that results may be measured and

evaluated. This consideration cannot be too strongly emphasized if we hope to make progress.

IX. Continuous and Comprehensive Curriculum Study

The general statement refers chiefly to those phases of curriculum study, evaluation, and testing which may be made in a comprehensive way. While I am in hearty accord with the presentation, I should want no one to interpret it as in any way giving sanction to the view that the individual teacher should not have full opportunity to introduce appropriate materials not already in the made-in-advance curriculum or to make any adjustments which his judgment regarded as desirable for the growth of his pupils. Actually, the curriculum as applied to any given class is never wholly fixed in advance. The material should always be clothed anew in terms of interests, situations, and conditions. The teacher should feel both the privilege and the responsibility for making appropriate adjustments. He should never be held arbitrarily to limitations which interfere with the growth of his pupils.

X. Measuring the Outcomes of Instruction

Accepting the conclusions expressed by the General Statement will mean ultimately the measuring of the results of instruction in terms of the major objectives set up to be achieved by the instruction. So far, measurement and testing have been limited almost wholly to the relatively subordinate objectives.

XI. The Rôle of Teacher-Training Institutions in Curriculum-Construction

If the recommendations made in this section of the General Statement are not accepted and acted upon, the acceptance of other sections can mean but little. The teacher-training institutions actually control the practice in the schools to a degree that makes them very largely responsible for what and how children learn in the schools. It has been emphasized that the school is a conscious agency for social improvement. To make it such an agency, teachers will have to be so developed and trained that they can lead the way in social improvement. Such training not only requires sound

scholarship in terms of functional subject matter, but also clear consciousness of the social and moral purposes of education and methods of procedure by which pupils are helped to grow in self-directed, self-chosen ways of efficient behavior. Teaching in harmony with the purposes and standards set forth in the General Statement calls for a technique of a higher order than that required for teaching when the objectives are but the learning of textual materials and processes. For the development of this technique in prospective teachers, the teacher-training institutions are responsible. For its development in teachers already at work, the further training of teachers in service is the responsibility of school systems with the coöperation of teacher-training institutions. These institutions have, therefore, a most responsible interest in changes in curriculum-making.

XII. Problems of Administrative Adjustment in Curriculum-Making

Here I would only urge that nothing in this section of the General Statement be construed to mean any administrative measure that would hamper the individual school or the individual teacher in making proper adaptations and adjustments to the needs of pupils. The learning process takes place in the individual classroom through the interplay of the minds of pupils and teacher. Any feature of the curriculum or of the administrative measures for its use which makes the teacher feel conscious of limitations which interfere with his freedom in doing whatever the needs of his pupils require, is a handicap both to good teaching and to true learning.

The spirit of this General Statement as a whole is that of a conscientious, sincere attempt to make the curriculum and its use a means of satisfying, efficient, educative experience for every learner and every teacher.

CHAPTER V

STATEMENT

WERRETT W. CHARTERS
Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

I have nothing to add by way of elaboration of the combined statement presented by the group. With the pronouncement I am in substantial agreement. The validity of specific points on which I may differ from my colleagues may well wait until it is settled by scientific techniques.

I approached the conference of the group with the hope that substantial agreement might be reached on one question—the controversial question of a child-centered curriculum. There are those who hold the position that the curriculum should be based entirely upon a study of the needs and interests of the learners. With this position I am unable to concur. Rather, I believe that the curriculum must be based upon the needs, interests, and activities of both children and adults. Naturally, therefore, I was delighted to find complete agreement among all members of this group on that point. When this fact became evident, I felt that, so far as I was concerned, the conference was a success.

CHAPTER VI

SOME NOTES ON THE FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM-MAKING

GEORGE S. COUNTS
Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

The primary object of this statement is to supplement the composite General Statement of the Committee. In no sense is it to be regarded as a formulation of a complete philosophy of curriculum-making. While prepared to accept the General Statement in its present form, I wish to direct attention to certain matters which, in my opinion, the Committee has neglected, to elaborate certain principles which it has deemed unimportant, to interpret certain passages which it has left somewhat obscure, and to suggest paths to be followed after the members of the Committee have come to the parting of the ways. My personal views can best be presented by organizing the discourse about the following six subjects: (1) the social purpose of education, (2) the function of the school, (3) curriculum-making and the nature of the learner, (4) curriculum-making and the nature of society, (5) curriculum-making and the organization of knowledge, and (6) curriculum-making and the scientific method. While the reader may feel that at some points this statement repeats the argument of the Committee, I have found it impossible to set forth my own thoughts without a measure of repetition. I have endeavored, however, to restrict this duplication to the narrowest practicable limits.

I. THE SOCIAL PURPOSE OF EDUCATION

The purpose of education is fundamentally social. In the absence of group life and the consequent growth of a social heritage, education could have but little meaning. From the beginning of human society the central object of education, whether carried on within or without the school, has always been that of transmitting to the child the accumulated experiences of the race, of training him in the use of the tools and instrumentalities of civilization, and

of inducting him into the membership of the group. Through this process, linked with discovery and invention, the group has survived and gained increasing mastery over its environment; and through this process the individual is enabled to stand on the shoulders of preceding generations and to profit from the achievements of the past. That the formal educational agencies have often been unaware of their functions and have occasionally even failed to make effective contribution to the achievement of this objective, does not invalidate the basic principle here set down. Whatever these special agencies may have done, if education in the large had not discharged its social functions, the slightest accumulation of culture from age to age would have been impossible; human society would not have advanced beyond the most primitive stages, and those characteristics of modern man which mark him off from the brute would never have appeared. Since the earliest times the very life of the group, the preservation of its possessions, and the advancement of its interests, have required the selective transmission of its accumulated knowledges, appreciations, ideals, and philosophies to each succeeding generation.

If education is viewed in this light, much of the point is removed from the query as to whether education contemplates as its end the present life of the learner or the life of the adult. The end of education is to be found in neither the one period nor the other, but rather in the growth of the power of the learner to cope with his environment—a growth which is nurtured through a direct participation in the life of the group and through a vicarious participation in the racial experience. The object of education is not to produce the adult (time may be entrusted with the performance of that task); nor is it to maintain the learner in the status of the child. The underlying purpose of tuition is rather to transform the child into a valuable member of society and, by means of a process of fertilization through the social heritage, to multiply his strength and increase his wisdom. Since the adult portion of the group embodies in its behavior much of this free gift from the past, education may take on the appearance of mere preparation for adult life. The more static the society, the stronger is this illusion. And in those primitive societies in which the past is perpetuated wholly by oral tradition, and in which the group experience survives only in the persons of the older members, this conception of education makes its

nearest approach to truth. But in any society such a conception contains serious error. The child should be equipped to perform many of the activities which adults perform, but often on a more generous scale and according to an improved pattern. Even so, the aim is not to prepare him for adult life, but to give him mastery over his world and to make him a guardian of the spiritual possessions of the group.

II. The Function of the School

The school is but one among many educational agencies and forces in society. It touches the ordinary individual directly for only seven or eight years in the course of his life and during this period for less than one-fifth of his waking hours. Moreover, except where the nursery school has appeared, his most plastic years are spent under the supervision of other agencies. During the pre-school age his education is largely in the hands of his parents; during the period of school attendance the home, the playground, the theater, the church, and the community perpetually engage his attention; and after his school days are over, shop, factory, club, civic organization, and political party exercise increasing dominion over him. Whenever the individual enters into communication with his fellows, whenever he adjusts himself to his environment, whenever he reflects on experience, the process of education advances. Consequently, anyone who constructs a program of education on the assumption that the school is the only important educational institution and that the highly specialized character of its educational contribution need not be considered, is building on the sands. Only as the school recognizes the work of other institutions can it perform its own functions effectively.

It should be observed, however, that in recent times the domain of the school has been greatly enlarged. In the more simple societies of the past, the school, where it existed, played a decidedly minor rôle in education and was generally regarded as a social institution of the second order. During the last century and a half, through the extension of formal education to all children, through the expansion of secondary and higher education, through the organization of numerous forms of vocational education, through the increase in the length of the school day and year, and through the

improvement of the methods and materials of instruction, the school has assumed the rank of a major social institution. Moreover, the day is apparently coming when it will take over additional functions which are now being discharged by other institutions. Already, in the form of the nursery school it is extending itself downward into the period of infancy, and in the form of various agencies for adult education it is reaching upward into the period of maturity. As the school takes on these new functions and enlarges the field of its operations, the task of curriculum-making must assume unwonted forms. But until the school embraces the whole of life, its special function will require careful definition.

So long as other institutions exist which carry educational burdens, the school should bear a double responsibility. Its function should be residual and normative.

In the first place, the school should supplement the work of these other institutions. It should do those things, necessary to the life and advancement of society, which they will not or can not do. If there is an educational task that is too difficult for unorganized instruction, if there is one that is too important to be left to the mercies of untutored learning, if there is one that makes little immediate and practical appeal, if there is one that serves the more remote and permanent social interest—in a word, if there is any important educational task that is in danger of being neglected, that task belongs to the school.

In the second place, in so far as it is able, the school should correct the educational errors committed by other institutions. This second principle is perhaps subsumed under the first, but it is so important that it merits special attention. Many of the influences which play upon the child in the home, on the street, and in the community can produce only harmful results. Most of the preventable ills from which men suffer can be traced to the defective or evil education supplied by society's own agencies. The great need to-day, in a world unable to use its knowledge and halting before the task of the humane ordering of its life, is for an institution free to devote its undivided energies to the work of education and thus dedicated to the purpose of bringing education under conscious and intelligent direction. Such are the responsibilities which should rest upon the school. In proportion to its strength

it should supplement the efforts and correct the errors of other institutions.

III. Curriculum-Making and the Nature of the Learner

The nature of the learner must be reflected in all phases of the school program. Curriculum-making, if it is to be effective, must proceed at every step in the light of the available knowledge concerning the traits and powers of the child. But this does not mean that the curriculum-maker is relieved of the responsibility of making decisions regarding the selection of the materials of instruction. Guidance in the construction of the curriculum is to be derived from knowledge about the learner rather than directly from the learner himself. The thought is sometimes suggested that the child should serve as an expert consultant on curriculum-problems! This doctrine, when given extreme expression, bears the obvious imprint of error, but in milder and more subtle forms it is not without its adherents. The limitations of this theory, as well as the way in which curriculum-making is conditioned by the learner's nature, may best be revealed by an examination of the problem in three of its aspects. In curriculum discussions the interests, the abilities, and the needs of the child are all invoked as sources of authoritative guidance.

1. The Learner's Interests

The major controversy appears to center in the question of interests. Much is said concerning the need of organizing the curriculum about the child's interests. That curriculum-making must have regard for these interests is obvious; but that this means an uncritical incorporation into the school program of any activity in which under any conditions the child may display an interest is clearly an indefensible article of faith. Yet the principle that the child's interests should be recognized is often given this interpretation. Any interest that the child may manifest is then regarded as a safe, and an almost sacred, pedagogical guide. The logical implication of such a doctrine is that the curriculum-maker has no function and should abdicate his office in favor of the interests of the child! The learner is made the artisan of his own educational program.

The chief cause of misunderstanding and error here resides in the widely current notion that the term *interest* carries a specific, rather than a generic connotation. From some of the discussions one gains the impression that the child's interests are fixed and predetermined modes of behavior which he has brought with him into the world, that they must always and everywhere be the same, and that they can be as definitely numbered and catalogued as the organs of the body. As a matter of fact, children's interests are potentially as many as the activities of mankind, as varied as the patterns of human culture, and almost as fluid as the passing fashions. They adapt themselves to the most diverse situations and assume both the color and form of their surroundings. The Eskimo youth displays an eager interest in acquiring the technique involved in the construction of the kayak, the Igorot boy longs to become expert in the war and festival dances of his tribe, and the American child of favored parentage covets an initiation into the mysteries of the art of reading. At best the term *'interest'* is but a loose and general category under which may be grouped innumerable activities possessing the quality of a measurably perfect union of subject and object. Even the food and sex impulses assume many forms and accommodate themselves to circumstances.

In educational discussions the adjective *'spontaneous'* is often used to qualify the term interest. To this word educational theorists seem to be extremely sensitive; but while some are attracted, others are repelled, by it. One will argue that in constructing the curriculum the interests, but not the spontaneous interests, of children should be recognized; while another will maintain that only as the interest is spontaneous can learning be carried on effectively. Undoubtedly, in many instances the strength of the controversy is merely a gauge of the degree of misunderstanding. The parties to the dispute attach different meanings to the same labels. Let us, therefore, see in what senses the word 'spontaneous' is used. We shall then be in a position to determine the measure of guidance which the interests of children can give us in curriculum-construction.

All interests are 'spontaneous,' in the sense that they spring from the individual's own nature; and, if the environment is made to include both the internal state of the organism as well as the external surroundings, all interests are 'conditioned,' in the sense

that they are provoked by the environment. Interests are always a product of the union of the organism with circumstance. If environing conditions are changed, existing interests undergo modification or are displaced by other interests. The term 'spontaneous' is sometimes applied only to those interests which are aroused by an unplanned environment and which arrive unheralded on the educational scene. To certain minds these unanticipated interests which appear in the absence of an environment purposefully arranged to call them forth take on a peculiar authority and sanctity. They are thought to be the instrument of a mysterious revelation of the nature of the child. In actual fact, they may throw less light on the problem than a series of carefully controlled exposures to a succession of different situations. They may be the pure product of chance, the fruit of unknown causes. This fact, of course, does not condemn them as unworthy. They may be good or evil; but whether they are the one or the other is not to be determined by their spontaneous or accidental appearance.

There is another use of the word 'spontaneous' which is of much more value to education. The appeal which a particular situation makes to the learner may be either direct or indirect, unmediated or mediated. The learner may feel an interest in an activity because of its own intrinsic worth, or he may feel an interest in it because it is instrumental to the attainment of some desired end. Interest of the first type may be legitimately styled "spontaneous." Since it provides the conditions for most economical learning, its value to education is almost beyond measure. Learning is prosecuted most effectively when the individual identifies himself most completely with the thing to be learned. Only under these conditions is there neither dispersion of attention nor dissipation of energy. Yet, that the purposes of education can be achieved wholly through interest of this type is a fatuous deception. A fair measure of the work of any productive life and a large share of the work of the world must be performed under the conditions of derived interest. Much of civilization itself may be regarded as an instrument of mediation between human desires and their satisfaction. Social life may be so organized in the future that the more arbitrary and cruel incentives to labor will disappear, but the hope of making all activities necessary to the life of society intrinsically interesting to those who engage in them is an idle dream. Moreover, the only

freedom that man knows in this world is that freedom which comes to him through the intelligent ordering of conduct, not on the basis of the appeal of the immediate moment or situation, but in response to environment spatially, temporally, and socially extended. In this power of self-discipline and intelligent self-direction the individual should constantly grow; and an education that has failed to promote this growth has failed at a critical point. Increasingly as the child matures, he should be expected to assume obligations and to adopt purposes which require the definite subordination of the personal and the immediate to the social and the remote. Only as the individual gains this power to stand alone in an enlarged world will he be able to direct the course of his own life.

What guidance, then, can the curriculum-maker derive from a study of the interests of the child? If learning is to proceed at all, the attention of the learner must be secured. And his attention can be secured only through a direct or indirect appeal to his interests. These interests must be utilized to the fullest possible extent, but they cannot be accepted as positive and trustworthy guides in selecting the content of the curriculum. They constitute the raw materials and determine the conditions of education, but they cannot furnish its goals. They reveal the present psychological position of the learner; they do not indicate the direction in which he should move. Until we have found the child's interests we have not found him—he is still lost in the educational woods. Only as his interests set limits to the educational possibilities may they be regarded as guides in the choice of the objectives of education. In the selection and validation of the content of the curriculum they should serve as negative, rather than as positive factors. *Nothing should be included in the curriculum merely because it is of interest to children; but whatever is included should be brought into the closest possible relation with their interests.*

2. The Learner's Abilities

The curriculum-maker must have the most careful regard for the abilities of the learner. At every point in the selection and organization of the materials of instruction, they must be taken into account. The alternative is educational futility and failure. This principle is so obvious in most of its applications that it requires

little exposition. A major reason for the establishment of the school as a special educational agency lies in the fact that many of the skills, knowledges, and insights essential to civilized life, are, in the absence of tuition, beyond the powers of the learner. If he is to acquire them, he must be introduced to them under conditions peculiarly favorable to learning. They must be the end-products of a series of carefully graduated activities. The central function of the school is to organize the complex fruits of racial experience in such a way that they can be brought within the range of the learner's capacities. In the measure that the curriculum in any of its divisions assumes powers that the learner does not possess, it is a defective and useless educational instrument.

The problem, however, is not merely one of bringing the curriculum within the range of the learner's powers. Its organization and presentation must be in harmony with his methods of learning. The child cannot appropriate the social heritage as he would take an apple from the hand. He must make it his own; and that means he must in some fashion live through it. However abbreviated a copy his experience may be of the original, he must have a genuine experience. Skills, knowledges, insights, and appreciations are the products of living, and they can be acquired in the school only as recognition is given to the laws that govern their acquisition. The major criticism of the conventional program of the school is not that adult views have been imposed upon children, but rather that principles of learning have been disregarded. The views of the society into which an individual is born are necessarily imposed upon him in much the same sense in which his physical environment is imposed upon him. If he is to enter the world at all, he must enter it at some point. He may lament the fact that he is thus made a creature of circumstance, but it is the price he must pay in order to be born. Yet, from another standpoint this environment supplies the nourishment for both body and mind. It may appear that he is being imposed upon, but he is also being helped so to organize his experiences that he may become an effective agent in the world. The weakness of the school is that it has been a less efficient social instrument than it might have been. Its intentions have been good, but its methods have been faulty. It has sought too often to give the child the spiritual possessions of the more mature members of society when the laws of his nature require that he must earn them.

The school can greatly facilitate this process of assimilation and acquisition, but the school cannot provide a substitute for experience on the part of the learner.

That a knowledge of the abilities of the learner may make a large contribution to curriculum-making is apparent. Yet, as in the case of interests, the contribution is largely a negative one. In determining the objectives of education and the general lines of activity to be recognized in the curriculum, the capacities of the learner furnish little guidance. Yet they do indicate what is feasible, they reveal certain limitations under which the curriculum-maker must work, they determine the organization of the materials of instruction, and they fix the sequences in the progressive arrangement of subject matter. They do not tell us what should be taught, but they do tell us what can be learned and how it can be learned most economically.

3. The Learner's Needs

Regarding the recognition of the needs of the learner, a very brief statement must suffice. Most certainly they must be taken into account in curriculum-making. From one standpoint the purpose of education is to meet the needs of the child as he seeks entrance into the social world about him and strives for mastery over its technique. But what are these needs? Unfortunately, they carry no objective label. The child's greatest need perhaps is a rapid and effective induction into the life of the group and into the use of his social heritage. But the nature of these needs can be determined only by the most careful study. Sometimes it is contended that the curriculum should reflect the learner's immediate needs. Even this suggestion throws very little light on the problem, because in the psychological sense any felt need is an immediate need. Although it may refer to a hypothetical future contingency, it represents a direct response to an extended environment which is a construct of the imagination. The most which may be expected is that the curriculum will give expression to needs felt by the learner. But one of the major tasks of the teacher and curriculum-maker is to arrange the school environment so that the child will come to feel the need for doing those things which the conditions of life make desirable.

Curriculum-Making and the Nature of Society

Much of the foregoing discussion has implied that the school curriculum should be determined in large measure by the nature of the society into which the child is born and in which he will presumably live. If the hypothesis is sound that the great controlling purpose of education is to induct the individual into the life of the group and to train him in the effective and critical use of the instrumentalities of civilization, the curriculum in all of its aspects should reflect an analysis—not necessarily of the activities of adults, but of the whole range and scope of contemporary social life. The curriculum-maker must therefore go to society for guidance in determining the specific objectives of the school and in selecting the materials of instruction. He must become a student of human society and social institutions as well as of the nature of the child.

Although the basic goals of the school curriculum can only be discovered by a thorough study of social life, these goals are not automatically revealed by such a study. The number and variety of activities in which both children and adults engage may be enumerated and catalogued, and social life and institutions may be analyzed in great detail. Objective investigation may reveal the great common interests and problems which grip the minds and release the energies of men. A sound program for the school cannot be formulated in the absence of the knowledge which such a study should give, but there are two fundamental reasons why it will not by itself either fix the outlines or determine the details of that program.

In the first place, in the absence of criteria of value, an objective study of human activities will not reveal which activities are good and worthy of perpetuation or which are evil and merit elimination from social life. A particular activity, though universally practiced, might be either lacking in positive worth or even definitely harmful to both the individual and society. The materials of instruction should be selected with a view to giving the child insight into society, the ability to use its institutions, an appreciation of the value of its possessions, a watchful regard for its welfare, and a compelling desire for its improvement. The limitations of a mere objective study of society are therefore obvious. It would fail to provide certain basic criteria of value necessary to a definition of

social welfare. It might, to be sure, give us a consensus of popular opinion and show what men generally regard as valuable. But criteria determined in this manner would merely reflect the ends for which the society under study might at the time be striving. These ends might include the merciless annihilation of another people, the enslavement of a less favored race, the exaltation of the mortification of the flesh, or the perpetuation of some religious, economic, or political dogma. Many activities which are now far from common should be accorded a place in the school curriculum. That curriculum should be determined in the light of social needs, but a study of the social situation will disclose those needs only to an intelligent and evaluating mind.

In the second place, a study of social practice will not reveal the special function of the school. As we have already observed, the school is but one among many social institutions which discharge educational obligations. Let us assume that all of the activities in which men do, or might, engage are ranked from the most valuable to the least valuable or the most harmful according to some acceptable set of criteria. Should the school begin at the top of this list and include as many of the activities as its limited resources permit? The answer is clearly in the negative. Its resources are restricted. Consequently, those activities which are provided for elsewhere should not be permitted to burden the program of the school. In determining what should go into this program the curriculum-maker should recognize one negative and two positive principles.

The negative or limiting principle is the principle of the maturity of the learner. No activity should find its way into the curriculum if it is not suited to the level of maturity of the learner. Since this principle has really been discussed already under the heading of the relation of curriculum-making to the nature of the learner, it requires no elaboration here.

The two positive principles are the principle of difficulty of learning and the principle of social foresight. According to the first of these principles, the school should assume rather generally responsibility for the more difficult learning tasks. Since the facilitation of the process of learning is its distinctive function, the natural expectation is that the more difficult tasks would be allotted to it. While in its simpler forms learning may be guided success-

fully by incidental and informal instruction, in its more complex manifestations it requires the careful guidance of direct tuition.

According to the second of the two positive principles, the program of the school should seek to guard and promote the more permanent and far-reaching social interests. Since its all-controlling purpose is educational and since it is relieved from those pressing demands of the moment which commonly dominate other institutions, it may become a peculiarly effective instrument for giving expression to social foresight and wisdom. In fact, the school is about the only instrument of this kind that society possesses. The mature generation is always the victim of its own past. At any moment society is so caught in the meshes of its folkways that its behavior lags behind its knowledge. It is for this reason that a study of the frequency with which men engage in various activities oftentimes throws but little light on the problem of curriculum-construction. Even if a particular activity is regarded as desirable, a high frequency may not mean that it should be included in the school program. In fact, a high frequency may even suggest that it would be learned outside the school. The school is an instrument for doing the difficult educational tasks, for anticipating the problems of the future, and for directing the course of social behavior.

Curriculum-Making and the Organization of Knowledge

The very fact that the school exists as a specialized institution for the promotion of education suggests that human experience may be organized in ways calculated to facilitate the processes of learning. To-day the school curriculum is composed of numerous separate subjects. Presumably, the task of learning is facilitated by this division into subjects. That the curriculum must always display some measure of differentiation seems highly probable and even inevitable. As life itself presents different aspects from moment to moment, so must the process of learning adjust itself to one aspect of the environment at a time. As the horseman finds himself unable to ride in all directions at once, so the learner cannot approach the whole world at the same time. The essence of mental life is its selective character. The need for a differentiated organization of the curriculum may therefore be assumed.

What may not be assumed, however, is that in the present program of the school knowledge is organized in the best possible way.

There are two reasons why the existing organization may be defective. In the first place, it may be defective merely because it is based upon a faulty or inadequate psychology. This thought seems to lie at the root of the criticism of the "school subject" found in the General Statement. There it is pointed out that "true learning" must be the test of the organization of knowledge that is employed in the school; and true learning here can only mean a learning that is genuine, a learning that results in the actual achievement of the purposes contemplated. The contention is made that much of educational effort may be relatively sterile because the learning process has not been well understood. This is conceded at once; but the need for a new organization of subject matter, particularly at the secondary-school level, rests in no small measure on other grounds.

The second reason why the existing organization of knowledge is defective is that the purposes of the school have changed. As the purposes and objectives of education in any particular division of the system are modified or refined, the organization of the materials of instruction should be altered. An organization that is adapted to one purpose can hardly be expected to serve another. Purposes may be wrongly conceived, but with the purposes given certain forms of organization of subject matter naturally follow. Now, in recent times the aims of formal education have been recast. Less emphasis is being placed on the acquisition of information and more on the development of habits, insights, appreciations, and attitudes. When a mind well stored with apt quotations and appropriate literary allusions is the end of education, the subject matter of the school will gradually assume a suitable form. And that form will tend to persist after a new conception of education has appeared. To say that the older generation misconceived the process of learning is an inadequate characterization. They may have been guilty of this charge. But our fundamental quarrel is not with the methods, but with the purposes of education which they championed.

For illustrative purposes, let us consider the organization of the conventional secondary-school curriculum. That curriculum was composed for the most part of foreign language, mathematics, abstract science, history, and English. The purposes which dominated this institution were those of formal discipline and preparation for college. That the older theory of mental discipline rested on an insecure psychological foundation or that the requirements of the

college reflected the conditions of a distant past, is a matter of little consequence here. The fact to be observed is that the organization of subject matter was derived largely from these purposes. In the meantime, with the extraordinary expansion of the public high school its purposes have been transformed. Whereas in the past the aim of this institution has been to prepare a highly selected group of students to pass examinations in Latin, French, algebra, geometry, ancient history, and physics, to-day its function is to equip the great masses of boys and girls of adolescent age for effective and relatively immediate participation in the life of society. That an organization of subject matter adapted to the achievement of the former purposes is also suited to the attainment of the latter is unthinkable. If the high school is to be an effective instrument in giving the ordinary adolescent insight into the natural and social world about him and in developing in him a sympathetic understanding of the major problems and issues of contemporary life, the curriculum should be organized with these ends in view. While experiment may show the wisdom of retaining certain of the lines of demarcation which have been inherited from the past, it seems altogether likely that many of those lines will have to disappear. The natural expectation is that the materials of instruction should be organized about the accepted purposes of the institution. If we would have the student gain insight into the problems of citizenship, we should seemingly bring to him from all available fields of knowledge the materials which would illuminate those problems. In developing desirable appreciations, attitudes, and ideals a similar course should be followed. While the experience of the past should by no means be lightly discarded, that experience, when gained in a different setting, should not be permitted to bar the way to bold educational experimentation.

Curriculum-Making and Scientific Method

In concluding this discussion, a word should be said regarding the relation of scientific method to the construction of the curriculum. This is a question of crucial importance. If in the history of the development of educational technique the present period is to be marked off from the periods which have gone before, the reason will be found in the fact that it has recognized the im-

portance of scientific method and has sought to use that method in the solution of educational problems. Morever, the results already secured clearly justify its introduction into the field of education and give promise of a much more productive future. Yet, if this method is to render its maximal service to the cause of education, the limitations under which it operates must be clearly understood.

Some, perhaps many, students of education incline towards the view that scientific method suffers from no limitations, that it is capable of giving an authoritative and final answer to all our questions, that in time it will compel agreement on all important educational issues as it compels agreement on the laws of physics. This is an alluring doctrine, and in certain respects takes on a pleasing verisimilitude. Up to a certain point and within a certain sphere it not only bears the appearance of truth, but even is truth itself. Yet for two reasons these ultra-sanguine hopes cannot be fulfilled: the science of education must exhibit in the first instance the limitations of all science; and, in the second, the limitations of applied science. Each of these points requires elucidation.

The basic limitation of all science is that of incompleteness. Science has as its object the discovery of truth, but apparently truth does not operate in a closed system. Every discovery seems to open up new areas for exploration. The unknown will always exist beyond the limits of the known. While the veil which divides the one from the other may be perpetually pushed back, few would maintain that it will ever be drawn aside. Consequently in so far as men must deal with the total of reality, they will always have to be guided at certain points by something less than exact knowledge. Call them guesses, hypotheses, or what you will, the guidance which they can furnish is far from trustworthy and intelligent men will exhibit honest disagreements. In the field of curriculum-making, because of the immature status of the foundation sciences of psychology and sociology, we are forced to-day, even in dealing with many of the more elementary problems, to resort to the most crude speculation. This situation can only be improved as the science of human society is developed. But this fact does not justify an attitude of indifference towards the complete utilization of the available knowledge. Whatever may be the current status of the science of education and its auxiliaries, they must always be em-

ployed to the utmost in curriculum-construction. In shaping the school program a measure of reliance upon guesses is necessary, but the time is past when the practice of placing reliance upon *mere* guesses can be defended.

The second reason for questioning the omnipotence of the scientific method in curriculum-making is of a somewhat more fundamental character. Even the most enthusiastic advocate of the method would grant the limitation discussed in the preceding paragraph. He would concede that, so long as our knowledge is defective, complete agreement among all curriculum-makers cannot be secured. He would also grant that our knowledge of man and society will always leave something to be desired. But beyond this he would probably be unwilling to go. Nevertheless, disagreements are likely to persist because the science of education is an applied science. Every science that touches human welfare, and this means all applied sciences, is circumscribed by some conception of welfare. Within this area and under the given assumptions, individuals will be forced to agree according to the measure of exact knowledge available. But even the engineer is unable to determine how many bridges should be constructed unless certain limiting conditions and qualifying purposes are given him. Science is an instrument and may be used in achieving the most diverse ends. Chemistry may be employed in producing foods or poisons, in conserving or destroying human life. Knowledge of the learning process may be devoted to purposes equally at variance.

The answer is sometimes given that a science of human welfare should be developed. But when one approaches the question of welfare, one seems to pass outside the confines of science. One immediately asks whether, in the formulation of the doctrine of welfare, equal regard is to be paid to the interests of all classes, sects, and races, whether health is to be promoted at the expense of aesthetic enjoyment, or whether the criteria of artistic appreciation are to be those of the Hottentot, the French, or the Chinese civilization. Scientific method can give no satisfying and conclusive answers to these questions. In vain have the sociologists sought an objective definition of progress. The difficulty lies in the fact that progress implies movement forward, and the direction in which one moves in advancing depends upon one's orientation. Every man sees the

world through his own eyes; every society faces the universe in its own way. What is progressive, or beautiful, or even good, is a product of the reaction of the individual or the group upon experience. Within the bounds of a single culture a large measure of agreement may be expected, but as the culture varies, disagreements appear. The ends which men regard as worthy are as diverse as civilization. And the increase of knowledge, if that were not accompanied by a general inter-penetration of cultures, could hardly be expected to produce likemindedness.

The bearing of this discussion on curriculum-making is plain. The fundamental goals of education cannot be determined by scientific method. They are the product of a process of evaluation which, while dependent on the results of science, cannot be identified with those results. As man learns more about the world in which he dwells, these goals will be modified and, let us hope, improved; but men will always disagree in some measure regarding the nature of the good life. Some will perhaps be inclined to judge the universe in terms of material prosperity, others in terms of beauty, and perhaps others in terms of justice. But, when once the purposes or goals of education are determined, the field is cleared for the work of educational science. There must be certain best methods for achieving these purposes. The discovery of those methods is the burden which scientific method must carry. We cannot hope that science can give us a complete educational philosophy, but it can at least give us an effective educational technique. After the larger goals are set, there is no educational problem which cannot be attacked by the methods of science. And even the selection of the goals must reflect the advancement and the refinement of knowledge, as it must reflect all human experience. Whatever measure of stability lies within the bounds of education will be the product of the operation of the scientific method, but the definition and formulation of human purposes, upon which education is dependent, will always lie somewhat beyond the reach of science.

CHAPTER VII

READING BETWEEN THE LINES

STUART A. COURTIS
Professor of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

The excellence of the General Statement makes it necessary for a critic to defend his attempt to add to, or subtract from, the collective wisdom of so many able minds. Therefore, let me hasten to express my complete acceptance of the statement as it stands. Each time I reread the document, I am filled afresh with wonder at its perfection. Every essential element is there, in its proper place and in due proportion. I regard the work of the Committee as a masterpiece, destined to have a profound influence upon educational thought and action. The comments which follow are offered more by way of interpretation than of criticism.

The product of the Committee's work is intended to call attention to the "direction in which curriculum-making is moving at present."[1] Since, however, persons holding very different philosophies made up the Committee, all that it was possible to do was to present facts, leaving the interpretation of those facts to the reader. Accordingly, in self-protection and in furtherance of the movements to which my personal efforts are being given, I shall attempt to express the philosophical point of view upon which my approval of the statement is based.

Life is a relay race in which each generation hands on its accumulated wisdom to the next. As teachers, however, we may do far more than merely transmit civilization. We may also interpret it, pointing out the distant goal, and setting the new generation running in the right direction.

Of course, a mistake here is fatal. If the runners are directed to the wrong goal, the race of life is lost at the outset. If no instructions are given, the runners will scatter in all directions and not more than one or two of them will by chance find the path in which all should go. For man to assume control of his own evolution is dangerous; for man not to assume control is wasteful. Yet a choice must be made. For myself, I prefer danger to waste. I regard

[1] Paragraph 1.

the statement on curriculum-revision as unnecessarily wasteful in that it does not openly discuss the question of choice of underlying philosophies. It does not make clear (1) that curriculum revision is the process by which the direction in which the civilization is moving is altered;[2] and (2) that he who runs and reads intelligently the clear record of past changes, need no longer run blindly. It seems to me that to-day the goal of cosmic evolution is more clearly revealed than ever before. Each maker of a curriculum has it in his power to contribute enormously to progress by directing the next generation efficiently toward the right goals. The danger of wrong choice of goals can be minimized by giving the necessary directions by methods which will leave the next generation free to change the goals when, it, in turn, comes to years of discretion and control.[3]

Whether he will or no, every curriculum-maker inevitably influences the direction in which the next generation moves. My thesis is that he should do so consciously and intelligently. I regard as weak and obscure the statement[3] by the Committee that "curriculum-makers are obligated to consider definitely the merits and deficiencies of American civilization." I want the statement to say in unequivocal terms: "The first step in curriculum-making is to set up a basic philosophy. This philosophy should be derived from a study of cosmic evolution and should formulate the purpose of life, and the destiny of man, as far as these ultimate goals may be discerned. *Then all selection and organization of curriculum-materials should be in terms of the basic philosophy.*"

This is no place to analyze cosmic evolution and formulate a basic philosophy. Fortunately, there is no need. The record of past changes in education is *in itself* an expression of the trends of the evolutionary process. Accordingly, I shall content myself with collecting the evidence of change in education presented by the Committee, and trying to interpret it.

Specifically, the evidence is to be found wherever the phrase "in times past and too much in the present," or its equivalent, is used in the Statement. Let us array it in tabular form.

[2] Paragraph 16.

[3] Paragraph 17.

EDUCATION TO-DAY IS MOVING

Paragraph Number		
(4)	*From* "imposition on children of adult forms of thought, feeling, and behavior"[4]	*To* "goals dictated by children's interests, needs, capacities for learning and experiences, as well as by the larger demands of society."
(5)	*From* disregard of the individual	*To* "work adjusted to contribute most fully to the development of the individual."
(6) (9)	*From* formal, academic, non-social standards	*To* the "test of the effectiveness with which subsequent situations are met by the individual." "It is of paramount importance that the individual participate effectively in social life."
(14)	*From* subjective, unchecked bases of selection and organization of curriculum-materials	*To* bases of selection and organization established by scientific studies of both children and society.
(16)	*From* disregard of life values	*To* "definite consideration of the problems of economic, political, social, and individual life."
(21)	*From* a narrow academic content of conventional skills and knowledges	*To* a content that "includes important attitudes, generalizations, and appreciations, and an understanding of the important institutions and problems of life as well as the conventional skills and knowledges."
(22)	*From* mass education	*To* "provision for individual differences."
(24) (25) (26)	*From* education as "subject matter set out to be learned, repeated, accepted ready made, given back without adequate understanding"	*To* education as "change in control of conduct," as "ways of responding *to be built by the learner* into his own character."
(28)	*From* a teacher-controlled process	*To* a process in which the learner, with a "maximum of self-direction, assumes responsibility for the exercise of choice in terms of life-values."
(40)	*From* a curriculum organized by subjects	*To* "materials of instruction assembled from the starting point of the needs of the learner, irrespective of the content and boundaries of existing subjects."
(44)	*From* a criterion of value based upon adult opinion	*To* a "criterion of value based upon measured contributions to facilitation of 'true learning.'"
(47)	*From* "curriculum-revision by individuals and by subjects"	*To* curriculum-revision by adequate groups of specialists, and as a whole.
(49)	*From* "measurement by mere subject-matter tests and examinations"	*To* measurement by tests "corresponding in type to the advances made in the curriculum."

[4] Quotation marks are used whenever a phrase or sentence is practically a quotation, even though a few words may be changed in order or form to fit the tabular form.

It seems to me that the statements of the Committee make it quite clear that the center of emphasis in education is shifting from subject matter to children. No longer will it be the approved procedure to attempt to clothe the child with wisdom as with a garment, or to mold him as a piece of clay is molded. All schools, even colleges[5] must become like child-gardens where conditions are made favorable for the growth of human beings. Education, in the future, is to become more and more the scientific culture of human nature. The success of educational effort is to be judged by the *types of individuals* produced, not merely by what these individuals know.

To focus attention upon the new center of emphasis, a new phrasing of the aim of education is needed. For many of us, "integration of personality" sums up in concise form the *implications* of all the comparisons made above. In cosmic evolution the sequence of emergence has been energy, matter, life, intelligence, personality. Personality is the latest, most complex, most influential product of the creative process.[6] In curriculum-revision, therefore, decisions as to selection, organization, and administration of both materials and methods are to be made more and more in terms of their contributions to integration of personality.

Immediately the question arises: "*When* is a personality integrated?" Again, there is need to sum up in concise form the carefully detailed, although unwitting, statement of the Committee. An integrated personality is one which is fully "developed"; which can "participate effectively in social life because he has built into his own character, by the assumption of responsibility and the exercise of choice in terms of life values, desirable controls of conduct"; which "has definitely considered the problems of economic, political, social, and individual life," and acquired from his consideration "a sense of responsibility for social as well as for individual progress." For many, the integration of personality is best described as the "process of helping an individual to help himself

(1) form ever more worthy purposes
(2) achieve his purposes ever more efficiently, and
(3) effect an ever more harmonious organization of his feelings and emotions in terms of his enduring purposes."[7]

[5] Paragraph 2.
[6] *Emergent Evolution*, Morgan.
[7] See *Legends of Smokeover*, L. P. Jacks.

The Committee has gone farther than merely to indicate the direction in which educational aims are moving; they have indirectly revealed also something of *how* integration of personality is to be brought about. Increasingly in the future "subject matter is to be organized in terms of the needs of the learner irrespective of the content and boundaries of existing subjects"; it will be individualized, that is, "adjusted" to his capacity and rate of growth. School work must provide for the "exercise of *choice* in terms of life values"; there must be opportunities for the "*assumption* of responsibility," for the "maximum of *self-direction,*" for "reasoned control" of behavior. *Throughout* their school careers—that is, from kindergarten through college, and to an ever increasing degree —pupils must be given opportunities to develop "attitudes of understanding and tolerance," and "to perfect habits of right conduct and creative self-expression." In controversial matters the school is "not to teach solutions," but "methods of attacking controversial issues" and is to try to develop "attitudes of open-mindedness and sympathetic tolerance."

The only step not taken by the Committee was to say explicitly that the new curriculum should be written in terms of the effects to be produced upon children and not in terms of subject matter. The first item in such a program may be characterized as Socialization. Children are to be given *experiences* which will open their eyes to the service rendered to them by others and which will lead them to feel obligated to render, in turn, service to others. They are to be trained in methods of coöperation with others by actually coöperating with others in the solution of common social problems.

The second item may be characterized as Vitalization. Children are to be given experiences in forming and achieving purposes. Subject matter is to be used solely as a means to such achievement, and only that subject matter is to be used which has a functional value. The conditions of achievement experiences are to be such as to open the pupil's eyes to the possibilities of the improvement of both personal and social efficiency, and to lead him to adopt permanently purposes of self and social perfection, or development, as a means of increasing efficiency of achievement.

The third item may be described as Inspiration. Children are to be given such experiences that they may come to see the whole of

life, both social and individual, as a collective struggle for huma betterment, may become oriented in the cosmic process, and ma know the joys of creative self-expression in service to the comm good.

One does not learn to ride a bicycle by playing a piano. Neith can a pupil learn to purpose and to achieve except by purposi and achieving. Education will move in the direction indicated l the committee only as fast as methods of teaching and testing a adjusted to the new aims.

Specifically, the methods used in the classroom must provi pupils with opportunities to form purposes, and if they form u worthy ones, the teacher must guide them until they form bett ones. Such guidance, however, is a farce unless it explicitly reco nizes the individual as a sovereign center of decision, selection, ar organization. Under the ideal here set up, the only compulsion th school can safely exert is the compulsion of reason. Developme of reasoned control of behavior is thus both the goal indicated b integration of personality and the means by which integration brought about.

Reasoned control must be exercised in more fields than purpo ing, however. Pupils must have opportunity to plan their own wo (assign their own lessons), judge the efficiency of their own achiev ment (mark their own recitations), and profit by their experienc (build up by generalization their own knowledge and wisdom They can develop powers of self-direction, self-appraisal, and sel control only when given opportunities to initiate and to gover (discipline their own behavior). All the fine idealism in the Com mittee's statement comes to naught as long as the methods used i the classroom are based upon autocratic, teacher-dominated, chil ignoring philosophies. Not until we measure success for ourselv and for the children by the degree to which they attain physica intellectual, and moral selfhood will our efforts at improvemer achieve their goal.

In other words, the curriculum of a truly progressive scho would be written in terms of activities and opportunities and no in terms of content at all. Government is such an activity. N group of individuals ever attempted self-government without mak ing use of a rich content of English, mathematics, history, scienc

and all the other so called "subjects" of the traditional curriculum. If subject matter is "adjusted to the needs and purposes of the learner, irrespective of subject-matter boundaries," each child will inevitably learn what is for him the most vital content.

Analysis of social life reveals ten great groups of activities in which all individuals ought to engage. These are (1) the nurturing activities—care of the immature, the ill, the unfortunate, the handicapped, the vicious; (2) the maintenance activities, those concerned with the consumption of food, clothing, shelter, specialized service, etc.; (3) the recreational activities of leisure hours; (4) the home-making activities of choosing mates, begetting children, and raising them; (5) the production activities, concerned with the preparation of food, clothing, shelter, specialized service, etc.; (6) the self-improvement activities of study, reflection, worship, etc.; and the three great groups of activities which facilitate all the rest, (7) communication, (8) transportation and exchange, and (9) government. This list is cited here to show how rich is the field of life-activities out of which the school curriculum will eventually be organized.

I venture to prophesy, therefore, that the curriculum of the future will be written in the following terms.

CURRICULUM OF NEW EDUCATION

Objectives	*Divisions*	*Activities*	*Skills*
Integration of personality Development of individual and social reasoned control of behavior for purposes of human betterment.	Socialization Vitalization Inspiration	Nurture Maintenance Recreation Home building Production Self improvement Communication Exchange Government	Self-Direction, Self-Appraisal, Self-Control, Coöperation — in — Purposing, Planning, Executing, Judging, Generalizing

The service of the Committee to American education in preparing an orderly statement of the essential facts about the changes that are taking place in curriculum-revision is very great. They have arrayed tendencies so clearly that he who will may perceive the inevitable outcome and decide for himself how far he will contribute of his talents to bring about the new day. As a nation we shall move

forward, rapidly or slowly, in terms of such individual decisions. For a while the conservative, the fearful, the closed-minded, may stand out for the traditional ways of doing things, but education as a whole, the Committee points out, is on its way. The process of natural selection will eventually do its perfect work. The results achieved will ultimately decide the issue. But if the great mass of the rank and file of the teaching profession could see the vision, if each worker were to short-circuit the evolutionary process by intelligent experimentation and planning, waste could be eliminated, progress accelerated, and ideals made real. All of us know from first-hand experience, both as pupils and as teachers, the inefficiency of our present efforts; each of us would make any sacrifice certain to bring about an improved social order. The one thing needful is that we experiment not blindly, nor in a narrow, personal way, but widely, intelligently, with eyes fixed on far-reaching outcomes and enduring values. We need to demand of ourselves, "What is the ultimate consequence of the change I am making? How does its direction compare with the course of nature?" We must build our individual philosophies of education according to the answers the facts yield to our individual personalities, and grant to the other fellow a similar right. But to act without considering the consequences seems to me to be irrational.

The Committee wisely says that "in view of the many innovations that are appearing, greater care should be exercised than ever before to validate proposed changes experimentally;"[8] it is unfortunate that it did not emphasize with equal clearness the obligation resting on each one of us to adopt as rapidly as possible the improved methods when valid evidence of their greater efficiency is presented. In any event, it is a professional and social crime to refuse to consider the larger issues involved in such curriculum-revision as we may be called upon to make; or worse yet, having seen the issues, to refuse, through fear, indolence, or indifference, to do our part to hasten the coming of the better day.

[8] Paragraph 44.

CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION OF THE GENERAL STATEMENT

ERNEST HORN
Professor of Education, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

Paragraph 4. The difficulty referred to in this paragraph arises not so much out of imposing upon children adult forms of thought, feeling, and behavior, as out of imposing subject matter which, in its organization and content, has little or no relation to the needs either of children or adults in life outside the school. The child's ability to participate in and to appreciate "adult forms of thought, feeling, and behavior" is much greater than has been supposed. Hence, paragraph four should be read and understood in the light of paragraphs five, six, seven, and eight.

Paragraph 8. The statement in this paragraph is fundamental, and its implications should be clearly understood. The curriculum-maker must make an actual analysis of the needs and activities of children *in life outside the school,* as well as of the needs and activities of adults *in life outside the school.*

It is strange that those who have so much stressed the place which children's interests play in curriculum-making should have neglected to study scientifically the needs and activities of children in life outside the school. The task proposed here is very different from the study of children's interests in response to the artificial problems and paraphernalia too often found in schools which purport to have their curriculum organized on the basis of children's interests and purposes.

For example, children are often required to write themes on subjects and under conditions that do not, and should not, characterize the writing of children in life outside the school. The vocabulary found in such themes is then paraded as that which the child needs. Obviously, the vocabulary used by the child in his school writing represents the child's needs only when he writes what he needs to write. The results of research show that the more he writes what he has occasion to write in life outside the school, the more the vocabulary used resembles that used by adults in the

writing which they do in life outside the school, and the less it resembles the vocabulary of the best-known theme lists.

Paragraph 10b. Formalism in the school is the result, not so much of an over-emphasis upon number and language, as of the teaching of these subjects out of relation to the needs either of adult or of child life. It is doubtful if the formalism found in teaching these subjects is greater, on the average, than the formalism found in connection with some of the traditional handwork of the elementary school. Indeed, the fundamental abilities developed even in formal instruction in reading, writing, spelling, and number are so obviously valuable in life and so closely related to its affairs, that it would be difficult to secure a separation so complete as in the case of those processes in handwork which have no relation to life, either in organization or in content.

Section II, as a compromise statement, must be understood in terms of certain questions which were raised by members of the Committee during the formulation of their report. The three most important questions which are not directly treated in Section II are:

1. Do the interests and needs of children overlap those of the adult or should the case be stated, rather, child needs and interests *versus adult needs and interests?*
2. Will, and should, the child work for deferred values?
3. Can the child's present needs and interests in life outside the school be isolated from their relation to his future needs and interests?

A discussion of these questions follows:

1. Do interests and needs of children overlap those of the adult or should the case be stated, rather, child needs and interests *versus* adult needs and interests?

There is often found the assumption that children are not interested in the activities of their elders. This assumption is unwarranted. It flies in the face of the most obvious conclusions of commonsense and of scientific analysis. For the boy to have it said that he acts like a man is to him the greatest compliment that can be paid. It has been pointed out elsewhere that the overlapping between the needs of the child and the adult is very great, not only with respect to the actual activities in which he engages, but also with respect to his needs for understanding and appreciation.

Many adult activities in which he can not yet engage and in which he may never engage are, nevertheless, from his point of view, worth understanding and appreciating.

It has been said that schools in the past have imposed adult values upon the child. The fact is that children suffer not so much from the imposition of unquestioned adult values in their natural setting as from the imposition of subject matter which either is unrelated to life or is formally arranged according to the interests of the subject specialist. But even the artificialities which attend the academic organization of subject matter are to be preferred to the pettiness and disorganization found in curricula built upon fallaciously assumed children's interests. Many of those who have written and spoken most voluminously about making the school vital to children have sinned most grievously in failing to build the curriculum according to the child's actual needs and interests in life outside the school.

Indeed, formalism, and verbalism arise, not primarily because the child's interests are neglected, but because instruction is divorced from the needs and interests of life outside the school. This separation is scarcely more complete between instruction and the needs and activities of children, than between instruction and the needs and activities of adults. In other words, formalism and verbalism tend to arise when subject matter becomes academic. Nor is such formalism limited to the "three R's." It is found as truly in other subjects.

2. Will, and should, the child work for deferred values?

In the discussion of immediate and deferred values, the assumption is often made that children will not work for deferred values, except when stimulated by generic interests, such as desire for good grades and pride in accomplishment. It is also assumed that it is not good for children to work for deferred values. The term "*deferred values*" is used here in the ordinary sense of values which are not felt as immediate or present to the children of a given grade. In reality, the term should refer to those skills, appreciations, and types of conduct which are not involved or needed in the child's present activities in life outside the school.

It is clear that wherever the child's life would be improved or enriched by the teaching of a skill or conduct-pattern which is ordi-

narily thought of as adult, or by bringing about a vital appreciation and an understanding which is commonly thought possible only in the case of adults, the value is not a deferred one. Moreover, it is clear that although there are many adult skills and types of conduct and appreciation which are not immediately needed by young children or possible of achievement by them, yet children *do* need skills and types of conduct and appreciation which constitute the first steps which lead successively through other steps to these more complicated or subtle values of adult life.

With this explanation in mind, the experienced teacher can see readily that children work for deferred values, not only when the values are not apparent in the needs and activities of children, but also when these values are apparent in the needs and activities of children only in a very simple form. The important thing is that the children shall be made intelligent as to the deferred values. With few exceptions, when children are not interested in deferred values, it is either because the deferred values are unreal or because the deferred values are not understood by them. An eighth-grade child can see the need of learning to spell *opportunity, receive, referred* and *recommend* (very difficult words often used in letters of application, in which spelling errors are severely penalized) if he knows that such words are very likely to be in letters of application, and even if he does not expect to make an application for a position in the near future. He can easily be led to interest himself in learning how to save and resuscitate a drowning person, even though, so far as he knows, the occasion for the use of this ability is indefinitely deferred. Experience in teaching vital but deferred values which the child appreciates seems to indicate clearly that children unquestionably are interested in the achievement of such values. In fact, the impression often given by children is that they prize such achievements more than the achievements of values more closely related to childish activities!

But the interests of children can never be taken as a safe index of what they should do. Is it *desirable* for children to work for deferred values? It seems clear that values of unusual importance or cruciality must be taught before the child leaves school.

But, aside from this requirement, to what extent should the child be encouraged to work for deferred values? It is useful to adopt

here Professor Kilpatrick's distinction between the primary factors, on the one hand, and the associate and concomitant factors, on the other. As far as the associate and concomitant factors are involved, it seems beyond argument that many such values are inherent in the attack which children make on deferred, but real values, the worth of which is at least intellectually appreciated by them. Among these concomitant values, one of the most important is that of *being able to work for deferred values,* rather than to be absorbed in those which, although immediate, are transient and unimportant. As to the primary factors involved, it must be kept in mind that the deferred values are at least the ultimate ones and that these values also are present values, year after year, through a longer period of time than are the transient values of childhood. It seems, therefore, that if the antithesis set up is between transient, childish interests and deferred values, proved to be of great importance, then the choice must be given to the deferred values. The fact is that no such antithesis needs to be set up, except in the case of a few marginal instances.

The solution to this seeming difficulty is to be found on the one hand in the clear overlapping which exists between the activities and needs of children and adults and, on the other hand, in the very vital need and interest which children have for understanding the activities of older people. Two illustrations will perhaps make clear the way this problem is to be solved.

The first illustration is taken from spelling. Should the child learn to spell words which have deferred value, but which at present he does not need to write? In general, the answer to this question is: "No, such a procedure is unnecessary." There are for each of the grades in which spelling is ordinarily taught in the public schools more words than can be taught which not only have deferred value but also present value. For example, *mother, like, go, school, the,* and *play* are all words of very high frequency in the spoken vocabulary of children at the time they come to school. Apparently, they are among the words for which they most frequently find use in expressing their thoughts. They are also among the words most likely to be used in the earliest occasions in which children need to write, aside from those occasions artificially set up in school. The words are likewise very frequently found in the read-

ing which the children do in the earliest grades. Evidently, then, these are words, the spelling of which and the recognition of which is of very great present value to the child. But these words are also among the most frequent words needed in the writing of adults, as well as in the reading of adults. In studying these words, therefore, in the earliest grade in which spelling is taught in the school, one contributes not only to the immediate use, but also to the ultimate use of these words.

On the other hand, there are a few words for which the child has little or no need in life outside the school during the period in which spelling is ordinarily taught in the school, but which are often used and severely penalized in the writing done by adults. These words must be taught before the end of the course of study in spelling. They should be taught, however, for obvious reasons, near the end of the course.

The second illustration is from the field of civic education. An analysis of the opportunities and deficiencies in the civic life of today cannot fail to show the need for a greater respect for other people's property. This need is present not only where deficiencies fall in the realm of the law but also where they fall in the realm of ethics. For example, the avoidance of trespass, considered in all of the essential ramifications concerning which an adult citizen needs to be intelligent, might be thought of as a deferred, or ultimate, value. But instances of trespass, as well as the ethical and legal principles involved in these instances, are found in the lives of children. For example, children who cut across lots in coming to school and thereby injure the lawns are committing trespass. The skills, habits, and attitudes which they need now in meeting this situation duplicate skills, habits, and attitudes which are needed by adults in meeting the same situation. In other words, these children are confronted by the same temptations and requirements as are adults. Moreover, this simple situation, confronted by children and adults alike, should be thought of by the teacher, as well as by the children, as one of a series of situations to be taken up in the effort, not merely to build uniform right conduct to specific situations, but also to develop an adequate understanding of what is involved in trespass as related to private property.

It will be readily seen that, although it is possible to get children to work for deferred values, learning proceeds more efficiently

when activities exemplify, not merely values which will recur in the future, but also values which can be utilized at once. In this way the child's development is facilitated, not only through direct instruction in the school, but also through the correct behavior which the school stimulates in life outside the school.

3. Can the child's present needs and interests in life outside the school be isolated from their relation to his future needs and interests?

A careful consideration of the nature of the child's development shows clearly that the immediate needs and interests of the child at a given stage of development can not be accurately understood out of their relation to his future needs and interests. Indeed, it is only by keeping this relation clearly in mind that parents and teachers can intelligently appraise the full significance of the situations in which a child is placed and guide him in making the best reactions to those situations. It is idle and misleading to say that education is life, not a preparation for life. It is both. Not only in school, but in life outside the school, the child is a learner, as well as a participant in life's activities. It is because of this preparatory function of childhood that the race attempts to prolong the plastic period by removing many pressures, economic and otherwise, and by setting up all sorts of developmental devices in school and out. The child not only shares with adults many opportunities and responsibilities for learning, but also has special opportunities and responsibilities for learning which adults do not have.

The situations in which children are placed and their responses to these situations must be defined in terms of the race's wisdom, not only as to what is good for children for to-day, but also as to the effect of to-day's habits, insights, and attitudes on the future. Tendencies either in wrong directions or in right directions are so defined only by considering these tendencies in terms of the ultimate goals to which they lead.

It is, therefore, imperative not only to make the most complete inventory of the important situations in which children are placed at each stage in their development, and of appropriate behavior in these situations, but also to make this inventory in the light of the ultimate standards of interpretation and behavior in these situations. Up to the present time such an analysis has progressed but little and such work as has been done has been accomplished by those

who are interested in the technique of determining needs and values in life outside the school. It is strange that those who so strongly urge that curricula should be based on childrens' interests should have neglected this important task, the completion of which would afford the only sound and concrete foundation for their theory. It is true that G. Stanley Hall and some of his followers did make a beginning in gathering data on childrens' interests, but with two grave defects in technique: they did not view the child's interest and behavior in terms of the opportunities and demands of the social situations in which he is placed, and they failed to relate correctly the child's present needs and activities to those of his future. Those who urge that the curriculum should be selected and organized on the basis of childrens' interests seem not only to have neglected such data as were produced by G. Stanley Hall and his associates, but also to have failed to produce on their own part a systematic analysis of what constitutes the good life for children at a given age.

Accordingly, curricula purported to be based wholly or primarily on childrens' interests give, to the extent to which this fundamental analysis is neglected, the appearance of pettiness, insincerity, fickleness of purpose, and lack of organization. Such curricula not merely do not point to the future; they give a sorry picture of a rich and balanced present life. The assumed interests in such curricula are too frequently *the 'straw' interests of 'straw' children.* They are largely accidental and transitory or, in so far as they are systematically organized, are based on the paraphernalia of materials and activities which have become conventionally associated with the theory. Consider, for example, the futile unreal projects which are so often demonstrated in training institutions as illustrating childrens' needs and interests, and copied wholesale by the teachers in training.

Conversely, it is not strange that schools in which the curriculum is constructed from the point of view of social utility (for children as well as for adults) show children most sincerely and naturally interested. Interests come from values; permanent interests from permanent values. It is a rare thing to find in school, classes of children who are not interested in situations and activities of vital concern either to themselves or to the older members of the community. The essence of success is that this vital concern be clearly seen and sincerely felt by the children. Given subject matter of

universal and permanent value, much of the problem of developing this vital concern is a matter of method and accurate grade-placement.

It should be noted, therefore, that the requirements laid down in Sections II, III, IV force the curriculum-maker to undertake a scientific analysis of the needs and activities of children in life outside the school, as well as of the needs and activities of adults in life outside the school. Assumptions and theories as to these life-needs will not suffice, either in the case of children or in the case of adults. Neither can the arbitrary, 'cooked up' school project, or problem, be made the basis for justifying the learning of certain knowledges and skills pertaining to these projects and problems.

Paragraph 29. It is important that the third sentence in this paragraph be understood within the limits of the intention of the entire paragraph. In other words, the efficient teacher or supervisor or curriculum-maker will have not "schemes of assimilation," but plans of attack in learning "made in advance" and as carefully as possible in the light of most successful practice as shown by experiment. Carefully devised plans are sometimes ineffective, not because they are made in advance, but because they are inefficiently and inflexibly administered without sympathy for the child's point of view and without an understanding of the difficulties which confront him.

Paragraph 31. The last sentence in this paragraph should not be taken to mean that when the teacher goes to school on any given morning, she has no idea of what she is to teach that day. It may be argued by some that the teacher, having her whole course of study in mind, can then utilize the daily life-situations and interests as they occur. It is true that the daily life-situations will be utilized by the efficient teacher, but this does not mean that the work of any given day is unpredictable. The fact is that a study of the needs and activities of the children of any given age in any given community will show clearly certain very important responsibilities, needs, and opportunities which are fairly common to all the children and which occur so frequently in their lives that the problem of relating these needs, activities, and responsibilities to the situations and interests of a given day is relatively easy. However, not only the poor and the average teacher, but even the very superior

teacher, must have the items in her course of study so carefully planned that most of the work of any given day or week is rather definitely determined beforehand. It must be remembered that the daily life-situations and interests of children which are not controlled by the home or by the school are largely accidental and have no greater value for educational purposes than those which are definitely controlled and even set up by the home and by the school. To expect a teacher to build a course of study upon the transient daily life-situations and interests of children, even when the broad outlines of the course of study are furnished to her, is to expect the impossible. Even if it were possible, there would be no value in it which cannot be secured by situations definitely set up by the teacher as a result of the scientific study of the needs of children of the age and type of those in her grade. Of course, an unexpected situation will be seized upon as an approach whenever it can be readily utilized to contribute to the purposes of the course of study.

Paragraphs 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 39. The difficulty with the present course of study is not so much that it is organized by 'subjects,' as that the content of the subjects and the relation between them is not right. While it is true that we need to broaden the individual's point of view for purposes of learning in school and for achievement in life outside of school, nevertheless we need a focus of effort. A mere breaking down of barriers between subjects and the unification of these subjects will remove but few of the objections which are here made. What is needed is not a mere combination of subjects, but a new organization, made on the basis of the study of the needs and opportunities of life on the one hand and the requirements of efficient learning on the other. The present courses of study are defective, not merely in the large number of subjects and the consequent dispersion of the child's efforts, but also in the failure to relate the subjects, both in content and organization, to life. As is pointed out elsewhere, there must be made a new synthesis of values as the result of a most careful study of the activities of children and adults in life outside the school. For every important item of value in life, there must be a corresponding item of instruction, and for every important group of values in life, there must be a corresponding group of values in instruction. In other words, the subject matter of the curriculum must be selected

and organized so as to fit the child directly and efficiently for the most important activities of life.

It is true that in the new synthesis referred to, some subjects may drop out of the curriculum or be absorbed in other subjects, and new subjects as well as new groupings introduced.

Paragraph 44. There should be added to this paragraph some such phrase as "in learning what should be learned." In other words, "the true learning process does not exit aside from something to be learned and certainly could not be measured by determining the efficiency with which the child learns what is not important to be learned." It must be kept in mind, as has been repeatedly pointed out elsewhere in this report, that the educational process must take into consideration *two* things: first, the inherent nature, and particularly the difficulties, of the learning process, and second, the degree to which the learned ability enables the child to participate in the important activities of life. In appraising the worth of any innovation, the second factor, rather than the first, must be the final criterion.

Paragraphs 45, 46, 47, and 48. The seriousness and the difficulty of curriculum-making can scarcely be overestimated. It is basic to the solution of most of the other educational problems. Textbooks cannot be made and selected, methods determined, convenient buildings constructed, efficient equipment secured, or teachers and supervisors adequately trained, apart from the type and quality of the curriculum which is made.

There are two methods of curriculum-construction and reconstruction. The first is to start *de novo,* proceeding first by an analysis of the needs and activities of adults and the needs and activities of children, and second, by experimentation to determine how to teach children to engage in these needs and activities with the greatest satisfaction and efficiency.

The second procedure is to start with school subjects, changing the content and organization within these subjects and forming them into new combinations. The second method is clearly less revolutionary and more capable of being done with less disturbance to schools in session. In the writer's judgment, neither alone is practicable; both must be used.

It must be remembered that the first procedure has scarcely been planned in outline form yet, and that it will require years of the most painstaking work on the part of a large group of superior individuals in each of a number of varied fields of interest. There is no question that this procedure needs to be carried out. Meanwhile, however, the schools must run. They must have some course of study. Therefore, the procedure to be adopted by local school systems, as well as by educational specialists who wish to give them immediate help, is the gradual improvement of the present curriculum through the better selection of the content of the school subjects, through the reorganization within school subjects, and through the establishment of new relations between subjects or new groups of subjects.

Even these minor changes—minor in comparison with those which would be made necessary by the first procedure—should not be put into practice without something more than the mere outline of the course of study. The proposed changes must be outlined in detail, the administrative difficulties carefully thought through, adequate materials and equipment provided, and teachers and supervisors appropriately trained.

Unless these things are done, the changed curriculum is likely not to get much farther than the distribution of the printed syllabus or to result in confusion and failure.

While it seems clear that it is more practicable for school systems to limit their efforts largely to the improvement of the present course of study, qualified persons should undertake the more direct and difficult problem of making the course of study *de novo*. However, it must be kept in mind that it will take years to make an adequate analysis of activities of adults and of the activities of children at various stages in their development. There will be also the related tasks of discovering efficient methods of learning. It should be realized that few parts of this job have been more than just begun and that many important tasks are almost completely untouched. It will be years, even if this procedure is adopted, before such a course will be ready to be tried out even in experimental schools. During that time, however, experimental schools will be useful for the stimulation of committees of curriculum-workers and for experimentation leading to the perfection of pedagogical organizations.

Paragraphs 49, 50, and 51. This section is, in the writer's opinion, one of the most important in the entire report. Progressive changes in curricula will be made by schools under considerable penalty if the success of such changes in the school system is measured by tests which do not take into consideration the purposes for which the changes have been made. The following criteria for making, judging, and selecting tests, and the illustrations of these criteria, may help to show the importance of keeping tests in harmony with purposes of the curriculum.

Criteria for Making, Judging, and Selecting Ways of Measuring the Outcomes of Instruction

First, the ability which the test measures must be an ability which the school should seek to develop. For example, the success with which the school is teaching children to spell the words which both children and adults need to spell in life outside the school cannot be measured by a test, standard or otherwise, which contains words which are not important either for children or for adults to spell and which does not contain the most important and most difficult words which children and adults do need to spell. Important abilities which are *not* tested are likely to be neglected. Unimportant items which *are* tested are likely to be over-emphasized.

Second, the test which is used in a given grade in a school, say in Grade VI, must measure what should be taught in that grade. In other words, it should relate to the purposes which are set up by and for the teacher and pupils in that grade.

With regard to these first two criteria, it seems clear that if a test measures what should be, but is not, contained in a course of study for a grade, or if it measures what *is*, but should *not* be, included in the course of study for a grade, the responsibility for results must fall on the shoulders of the textbook-maker and curriculum-maker, rather than upon the shoulders of the teacher and the pupils. It is still not uncommon for pupils of a given grade with a superior course of study, superior books, and superior teaching and learning methods to be given a low rating because of the fact that their spelling ability is measured by means of a test which not only contains words which the pupils of the grade are not expected to learn and fails to contain words which they are expected to learn, but also contains words which pupils of no grade should

be expected to learn. This is obviously an unfair and absurd practice educationally and cannot fail to hamper the improvement of courses of study and teaching methods. This illustration is chosen from spelling because of the concreteness of the data. The same defects can easily be shown, in principle, in other types of tests now prevalently used for other subjects.

Third, it is particularly important that the test used should not only consistently measure what it purports to measure, but it should also be of the sort which can be rated accurately by teachers without the variability so often manifested in teachers' marks.

Fourth, the test should be of the type which can be utilized to show teachers and pupils the progress which they are making in the attainment of desirable objectives.

*

CHAPTER IX

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

CHARLES H. JUDD
Director of the School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

The comments which are here made on the General Statement are intended to indicate some of the emphases which the present writer would lay on the various parts of the statement. By way of general formulation of his theory of the curriculum it may be said that he looks on the school as society's agency for guiding individuals from the immature, relatively unsocial modes of behavior and thought exhibited in infancy to the mature more completely socialized forms of thought and behavior exhibited in adult life. The writer has no hesitation in recognizing present adult society as possessed of the highest form of organized adaptation that the world knows. For example, the use of language and of number as exhibited by mature individuals must be thought of as achievements which no individual could have accomplished by himself and as modes of adaptive behavior which are unqualifiedly of the highest importance. Man lives in a world of social relationships made possible by language and number. Man would be utterly unable to make the scientific attack on the world which is characteristic of modern civilization without language and number and other similar devices which have resulted from social coöperation.

It is the belief of the present writer that the mastery of language and number and the other instruments of civilized life is not possible through any ripening of instinctive powers, if ripening means unaided, unsocial, individual growth. He does not regard any formula which can be derived from the study of instincts or physical inheritance as adequate to the explanation of the educational process. The only possible understanding of the functions of the school which can be derived from sound psychology is, he believes, one which recognizes the mature individual as a product of social control by the group. The mature individual is supplied with his most significant modes and materials of thought by civilized society.

The mature individual is to be thought of under the formula here adopted as an organized being, with modes of thought and

action derived from his original nature as remoulded and controlled in the highest degree by the example and insistent demands of the group. It is futile to attempt any psychological explanation of the individual or the formulation of any theory of education which does not emphasize from the first and throughout the distinctly social character of mature civilized life.

On the basis of what has been said it is clear that the present writer's understanding of the Section II of the General Statement is as follows:

Adult forms of thought, feeling, and behavior have been too much imposed on pupils in the sense that an immature child is often asked at too early a stage to adopt complex and highly elaborate methods of thought for which his immature contacts with civilization have not fitted him. To the present writer this statement does not magnify the individual's nature and minimize the importance of society. On the contrary, the difficulty which pupils have in attaining language and number shows clearly that the individual is in need of long, tedious guidance under the most attentive and sympathetic control in order to rescue him from the social incompetency which is characteristic of his infancy.

When, in Section II of the General Statement, it is urged that the child's interests be made matters of full consideration, it is understood by the present writer that the fundamental reason for this caution is that it is only through the understanding of infant nature that the changes can be wrought which will change immaturity into maturity.

In order to make as clear as possible the position here defended, it may be set over against another view of children's relation to education which is sometimes defended. It is said that pupils should be adopted as the guides to the educational process because the natural unfolding of their interests and desires will lead them forward to that stage of maturity which is to be desired as the end of life. The view here defended is based on a categorical denial of the assumption that the individual unfolds because of inner impulses into a civilized being. Civilization is a social product. It requires coöperation for its maintenance exactly as it required coöperation for its evolution. Even Shakespeare did not create the English language. No child can evolve the English language. Slowly and through great effort and with the help of much patient

guidance, the pupil may after long years come to the point where he can share in the social inheritance of his English-speaking environment. His nature will, it is true, unfold in the process of its adoption of the English mode of thought and expression, but this unfolding is not a spontaneous form of growth prompted from within.

The concrete outcome of the doctrine here set forth is that in the first grade, or even in the pre-school period, society shall clearly and insistently bring to the infant's attention those demands of civilization and those appliances of civilization which have proved effective in determining modern life. This means that the alphabet, the printed page, Arabic numerals, the school schedule with its demand for punctuality, the laws of property-right, are all perfectly respectable items. They are not matters about which teachers should be backward or apologetic. The present primary curriculum is in no sense of the word likely to go on the scrap heap. Some of the radical proposals which have been heard in recent times about sandpiles as substitutes for books, and manual-training shops as substitutes for libraries, and gardens as better than multiplication tables, will probably be repeated from time to time, but there is no real probability that they will overthrow the school in the future any more than they have in the past. Books and libraries and multiplication represent the high achievement of civilization. They will not disappear because a few educational radicals think they can be dispensed with.

It may not be out of place to pause and comment on the fact that what has been said is by no means to be thought of as neglecting the rights and possibilities of the individual. A true view of the individual's relation to nature does not contemplate the wholesale transformation of nature to suit the individual's tastes. Modern natural science is the basis of invention because it has taught men how to conform to natural law. We conquer nature only when we fit our behavior with the highest degree of precision to natural law. So is it also in the realm of social phenomena. We use English well only when we conform to the laws of our vernacular. The individual is not degraded because he learns the laws of chemical action, nor is he deprived of his individuality by acquiring mastery of Arabic numerals and their laws.

Turning to Section VI of the General Statement, the present writer would once more express a view which will perhaps be

thought to put emphasis on the conservative side of the pronouncement there made. It is not to be understood that subdivisions of teaching and learning are to be thrown overboard. The Herbartian experiment of the Jena school of adopting a core of historical narrative and regarding all other subjects merely as radical lines branching out from this historical narrative has been observed with interest by many American students of education. It had the advantage of relating ideas somewhat as they are related in ordinary life. It was a wholesome antidote to the extreme specialization which has resulted at once in the progress of modern science and its limitation. But the Jena experiment failed to recognize the fundamental law of concentration of attention, which is the psychological explanation of specialization.

Modern intellectual history exhibits many examples of the rise of intermediate sciences which are needed to overcome the limitations of rigid specialization. Physiological chemistry and physical chemistry are among the most productive modern sciences. They are illustrations of the necessity of reorganizing science in order to promote an intellectual mastery of the world. But physiological chemistry makes progress just in the degree that its special problems are made subjects of explicit scientific attack by the concentration of attention upon those problems by trained specialists. We are here in the presence of reorganized concentration of attention, not in the presence of an unspecialized, rambling, cursory view of the world.

There is some danger that Section VI will be accepted by certain persons whose tendencies are toward happy-go-lucky picnicking as a substitute for study as absolution of their sins. The present writer takes the opportunity to express the view which he believes the section to set forth that new syntheses of knowledge are demanded, but that knowledge will always have to be systematized and arranged in coherent subjects.

Especially is it to be reiterated that new materials need to be imported into the curricula of American schools. The present curriculum of the elementary school is in the main a product of a period when life was relatively simple and when the various sections of the American people lived under rural conditions. The omission of explicit instruction in American institutions has been one of the serious defects of our educational system. In order to remedy this

defect, it is apparently going to be necessary to reconstruct in a very fundamental way the materials of instruction. The reconstruction here called for is not a task to be turned over to untrained and inexperienced girls of the type which one usually finds in charge of elementary classes. Nor is it to be turned over to those shallow reformers who hold that because present-day curricula are not satisfactory, all systematic intellectual life should be abandoned. The effort to build up coherent thinking is an arduous technical task and requires systematic thinking and orderly intellection. The meaning of Section VI, as the present writer sees it, is that the materials of instruction need to be amplified and rearranged and organized. The emphasis is on organization. The statement is not an invitation to plunge into intellectual chaos or to follow the caprice of untrained or immature minds.

It is important that American education be supplied with the agencies which can effectively work out the reorganization contemplated in the general statement. The present writer is highly skeptical about the possibility of this reorganization resulting from scattered and unrelated thinking and experimentation. The natural sciences have found that the most efficient method of promoting their development is through a national organization which synthesizes the efforts made by all the individuals and academic centers engaged in the promotion of science.

The day is not far distant when the educators of this country will find that it is essential to the successful accomplishment of their task to organize a National Educational Research Council, which can coördinate in a large way the scattered efforts which are being made to reconstruct the curriculum.

The exhibition which the General Statement gives of so high a degree of concord among the members of the group which formulated it, is, in the mind of the present writer, highly significant, as indicating what could be accomplished on a large scale if a National Educational Research Council were in existence.

CHAPTER X

STATEMENT OF POSITION

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK
Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

SIGNING THE STATEMENT

A personal word as to the signing of the introductory statement may not be out of place.

Anyone who has taken part in any thorough-going discussion of curriculum-making will admit that it is one of the most controversial of topics. Certainly almost, if not quite, all other educational disputes enter to complicate it. Naturally, then, when the men whose names are subscribed to the introductory statement began to consider "controversial issues in curriculum-making"—for that was the original statement of the enterprise—great differences of opinion at once appeared. If we conceive a scale of divergence from the *status quo* of curriculum-practice, the several men were soon seen to be scattered along this scale, some less inclined to change from what is, others more inclined, no one quite agreeing with any other. These relative positions changed little during the discussions, though there were, of course, minor shiftings, according as now one aspect of the problem and now another was up for consideration. As to the extreme position, this writer believes that he may fairly claim the honor—or ignominy—of consistently deviating most from the present practice.

One effect of this extreme divergence was to fasten on the writer the obligation to yield most in the effort at agreeing upon the next practicable steps to be taken by American education in the remaking of its curriculum-theory. Naturally, actual practice could not be expected to change quickly. The smaller steps advocated within the Committee would thus be more feasible than the larger.

In this way the writer found himself, in the end, in the position either of refusing to coöperate in a joint statement or of making so great concessions as to cause him at times to wonder what of his own position was left. However, when the words "next" and "practicable" are stressed and the phrase "some of them transi-

tional" is considered, he would be but churlish who could take active part in the whole discussion and then not join with the others in advocating what do in fact seem to be the most feasible next steps to be taken by American practice as a whole. The words "as a whole" demand attention; for many, many schools in our country now show practice which in the writer's judgment is far in advance of the position set out in our General Statement. But if America as a whole will ponder and accept the joint statement that has been offered, the writer, for one, believes that it will improve upon what now generally prevails and that we shall then be in position to go on faster and farther to the better things that lie still beyond.

In order to hasten both the next steps and those thus still beyond, the writer proposes to set out, as clearly as he can to be brief, the considerations which impel him to accept a curriculum-theory widely different from that customarily followed.

The Educational Theory Underlying the Curriculum

Within the limits available, only an outline sketch of the theory of education underlying curriculum-construction can here be presented. Even so, part of this limited space must, for the sake of connected argument, be given to some rather obvious introductory principles.

The Curriculum as Part of a Larger Whole

The curriculum is part, or perhaps better, a phase, of a larger working whole. This whole we may call "the educative process." It is truly a process, in which the learner's past affects the present and both will influence his future. Within this on-going educative process it is easy to distinguish as parts, or phases, not only the curriculum, but also such other things as subject matter, learning, teaching, textbooks, method, objectives. Some of these so overlap that we cannot say where one leaves off and the other begins.

Since the curriculum is thus part of a whole, it must fit the rest of the whole. It will do its work best when it allows and helps the other parts to do their work best. We must, then, think of these other parts while we are planning to make the curriculum. Eventually, all must work efficiently together. The curriculum is, then, good in the degree that it best helps the work as a whole.

Learning and Life

In any adequate discussion of the educative process two things will stand out prominently, learning and life. Learning of the right kind helps one to live better. In the last analysis we concern ourselves about education and learning because we wish our pupils to live fuller and better than they otherwise would. It is living that fundamentally concerns us.

In order to guide the educative process we must then, know (1) how learning takes place, (2) how learning enters life to improve it, and (3) what kind of living is good. Whatever else is to be true about the curriculum, it must fit the answers we give to these questions. It must enable learning to go on best; it must carry learning efficiently into life; it must serve the right kind of life.

What 'Learn' Means

What does it mean to learn? When has anything been learned? What does this mean for the curriculum?

As we are primarily concerned with life, so here we are concerned with behavior. To learn is to change one's ways of behaving. Typically, to learn is to acquire a new way of behaving.

Consider this word 'acquire.' When has one 'acquired' a new way of behaving? For certain laboratory purposes other definitions of 'learn' might suffice, but for life the answer seems clear. One has acquired a new way of behaving when one *can* and *will* behave in the new way as the right time presents itself. Suppose I ask you, my reader, what is 5 x 3? The answer 15 comes at once. Moreover, it comes of itself. Could you by trying have kept the answer 15 from coming to your mind? I doubt it. This is an extreme case, but it illustrates the essence of learning. (When a thing has been really learned, it has in it an inherent propulsiveness which makes it try at the right time to work itself out in behavior.) It is in this way that learning concerns life. It inherently changes behavior, not only what one *can* do, but also what one *will* do. Our pupils have in the full sense learned when upon the proper occasion they *can* and *will* behave in the new way. The curriculum must make for this kind of learning.

How Learning Takes Place

With this propulsive notion of learning, how does such learning take place? And what kind of curriculum must we then have?

Five things can be said:

1. Practice is necessary. We do not learn what we do not practice. If it is a skill we are considering, we must practice the skill. So with an idea. So with an emotional response. So with an appreciation. Whatever the behavior, if it is to be learned, it must be exercised. If my child is to learn kindness to his sister, he must practice being kind to his sister. And note here: For learning purposes, kindness is of such sort that we do not practice it unless we mean it. My child must mean to be kind to his sister before we can say he is practicing kindness. The real practice of behavior is thus often, if not always, a matter of inner attitude as truly as of outward movements. We cannot acquire a response except as we practice that response.

The curriculum, then, must include such practice of the desirable traits as makes possible their learning. Some things, as writing or spelling, can be assigned and we can (within limits) hold children accountable for them, but there are other things that cannot be so assigned. We can make a child stay after school for half an hour, but we cannot make him practice kindness during that time. Nor can we assign honesty as a home lesson for to-night with any hope that one lacking it will have learned it by to-morrow or, in this way, by many to-morrows. These things can be practiced only in such life-experiences as in fact call them out. Our curriculum must, then, be the kind to include such life-experiences. It, accordingly, cannot be made up merely of assignments, because some highly desirable traits cannot be assigned. To give all the needed practice we must, then, change our notion of the curriculum. The first condition of real learning demands that the curriculum include real experiences.

2. The intent of the learner counts. For behavior to be acquired, we should mean to acquire it. Observed facts indicate that the more fully we mean to acquire any way of behaving, the more quickly we acquire it and the better it sticks. Further, the same intent makes us learn both from failures and successes. When we intend to acquire a certain way of behaving and make varied efforts,

some succeeding, others failing, we learn *to do* the ways that succeed, we learn *not to do* the ways that fail. Still further, associated feelings of satisfaction or annoyance may suffice to determine whether we count a thing as a success or not. Mere practice, then, is not sufficient. Success (or failure as viewed by the learner) is thus an essential factor to say *what* will be learned. Whatever we do with success and satisfaction we *tend* to do again; whatever we do with failure and annoyance we *tend not* to do again.

What does this tell us about the curriculum? It tells us that there are some things (and they are often the finest things) which we cannot hope to have our pupils learn properly unless they have proper attitudes in the matter. But some will say: "That's just it; our pupils don't all have the proper attitudes. What, then, are we to do?" True enough, but we must face the facts and not blink them. As we saw under Practice (just above) and see now from another point of view under Intent, some highly desirable learnings simply won't take place unless the pupils practice them in, or with, a certain frame of mind. Practice (outward) courtesy wishing to be courteous and we get one kind of result; practice (outward) courtesy wishing not to be courteous and the learning outcomes are quite different. The frame of mind, or attitude, necessary for positive, rather than negative learning, will not come just because we command it to come. If the attitude is lacking, we must take the pupils where they are and work gradually for a better attitude. "But," you say, "that disarranges my work. I can't set aside the prescribed course of study in order to build these attitudes. I have certain subject matter to be taught and I'll get behind if I set that aside." Thus, again, do we have to change our old notion of the curriculum. The right curriculum will take account of attitudes, ideals, habits, appreciations (all matters that cannot be assigned and are hardly to be taught directly at all) as well as of the more assignable skills and facts. Skill and facts and memorization can be made out into a regular schedule and be so taught (at least in a fashion), but these other and weightier matters must be taught differently. They can be learned only in vital experiences and the kind and quality of experiences necessary for this are less subject to our control. Not only, then, must the curriculum include experiences, but the outcomes of these experiences cannot

be exactly foretold. They must in considerable degree be caught as they come. It thus follows that we simply cannot state precisely in advance either the occasion or the length of time necessary for acquiring some of the most desirable moral outcomes—those which depend most on the learner's attitude. The experience type of curriculum must accordingly be more flexible than the old subject-matter curriculum. Whether we like it or not, the old type of curriculum, with its precisely fixed-in-advance subject matter, won't bring all the needed learnings.

3. Learning may come by association. If two things happen together, emphatically enough, either one later present to mind will likely recall the other. Yet association may shift a response from one stimulus to another associated with it. Thus Pawlow's dog learned to secrete saliva (have his mouth water) at the ringing of a bell, because the bell was rung day after day just as the dog was smelling savory meat. At first, only the meat could make the mouth water. After a time, the bell by itself would bring the flow. Association had got in its work.

In this way especially do we build our likes and dislikes. The next paragraph in part illustrates it. We tend to like the person or the place or the thing which is pleasantly associated. We tend to dislike those that are unpleasantly associated. The curriculum must take positive account of these associated learnings.

4. Learning is never single. We cannot start a child to working at any one thing and suppose that he learns just that one thing. The facts are quite otherwise. While a child is memorizing a poem, for example, he is building—and of necessity must build—attitudes, favorable or unfavorable, toward the particular poem, toward poetry in general, toward teacher, toward the teacher's way of managing, toward school, toward his own future education, toward matters of the intellect in general. He is learning, well or ill, positively or negatively, to coöperate with his fellows in respect to teacher and in respect to law and order in general. In like manner while he is studying "composition," he is learning not only about margins and punctuation and the like. He is at the same time building in himself attitudes which will help to determine whether in the future he *will* or *will not* use proper margins or punctuation, *will* or *will not* write neatly and accurately, *will* or *will not* write at all beyond the barest minimum of social or business compulsion.

These two considerations of association and of simultaneous learnings make definite demands on the curriculum. To teach composition or a poem without considering these inevitably attendant learnings is little, if any, short of criminal. Incalculable harm may easily be done. The ordinary course of study states the content of the curriculum as if some of the outcomes (skills and knowledge) could be got separately from the rest (habits, attitudes, and appreciations). This is impossible. The habits and attitudes will always come along with the others, but they may be bad. Come they will, the only question is in what form they will come. Since the skills and knowledge can be tested (even better nowadays by standard tests), the teachers are often judged by them and so, to please the authorities, teachers are often practically forced to damage their pupils by working for what can be tested in a way to hurt what cannot be tested. The situation is serious. The remedy seems to be twofold: first, give real leeway as to the time requirements for desirable facts and skills, then work for all the outcomes together, noting that the habits and attitudes are in the long run the most important. This again means an experience curriculum. Attendant learnings are inevitable. Only in a curriculum of actual vital experiences can these accompanying learnings be adequately cared for.

5. Isolated learning is doubtful learning. The older idea was to teach the logically distinct elements of a process in separate isolation, in the belief that later they would be joined together into an efficient working whole. The facts seem to deny this. The term "isolation" is the crux. By learning in isolation is here meant that the learner does not see or feel the utility or pertinence of what is being learned to any matter of present concern to him, and accordingly he does not intelligently join or apply it to any actual situation. It is, of course, true that we may have all degrees of felt relationship, but the closer the conscious relationship, the better the learning. Later, there should be generalization, but seldom so at first. Ideally, it would seem, the learner should not only see and feel the pertinence of what is being learned to some enterprise he now has under way, but he should as far as feasible also get his motive for learning from the felt relationship. Thus are learning conditions best met. Practice and intent go together.

The objection here urged against learning in isolation does not rule out drill. On the contrary, it suggests the conditions which

will make drill more serviceable. In learning to skate, felt relationship to an actual enterprise gives real motive for real drill. And the learning is both rapid and sound. The would-be baseball pitcher will practice his curves on every occasion. Felt pertinence and relationship not only give motive, but also supply the test of inherent success. Here drill comes, as it properly should, after actual experience has shown its need. Drill is, then, for the sake of more efficient relationship. Motive and relationship are thus inherent in the actual enterprise. Analogous considerations hold of fact memorization. Isolated facts tend to drop out of mind. Seen relationships to felt problems fix facts for future recall. Felt need for skill and information is the surest road to learning them.

Isolation thus seldom pays. In the degree that the learner finds efficient motive to learn any matter from its pertinence to some concern of his own, in like degree may we reasonably expect the following valuable simultaneous results to attend. The learning will probably be well done, since practice and intent are both secured. What is learned will be so jointed and related in its natural setting that it will more likely be thought of when the time comes (natural cues will call it up). Moreover, having been learned as part of a whole, it will more likely work efficiently with the other members of the relating working whole. Still further, the attendant learnings will more likely be favorable. All of these considerations forbid learning in bare isolation.

The curriculum-maker is, thus, again directed to experience as the unit element of curriculum-construction. The trend of a century is certainly in this direction. Originally isolation ruled. Once separate letters came first, then spelling, then words in connection. With writing it was "pot hooks" first, then letters, then words, and finally sentences. Grammar preceded composition. Nowhere could the learner feel real pertinence. Everything was a preparation which only the teacher fully saw. Now we reverse these processes, to the learner's manifest advantage. Isolation hurts. The felt connection of actual experiencing teaches best.

How Learning Enters Life

How, now, does learning enter life to improve it? If this be not effected, our curriculum fails.

To understand how learning enters life, we must look at life and essentially at life outside of the school. For, in spite of our academic prejudice, out-of-school learning still remains the essential type of learning that it has always been, and moreover, it is besides, in both bulk and importance and probably in quality, the most important learning that we have. Out-of-school learning is the rule in both pre-school and post-school life, while during school days it surrounds and permeates school life. Indeed, at best the school merely does better what otherwise goes on just the same.

For our purposes, out-of-school learning comes by two roads: one by way of association we have already in part discussed, the other is more strictly instrumental and comes as we meet and solve a situation of difficulty. The responses that we learn in thus facing difficulties vary from the motor type (as skating) to the intellectual (as solving a problem in symbolic logic) with intermediate combinations of the two in between. The commonest are such as learning to drive a car and the many instances where one 'decides what to do' or 'makes up his mind.' The essence of the matter is seen whenever one undertakes some enterprise, large or small, either as a whole or as part of a larger whole, and finds a difficulty which he then contrives to overcome. This kind of learning is the key conception to the new curriculum. We must examine it closely. A simple case will illustrate all.

Suppose a baby has for some time been fed with a spoon. To-day he undertakes to feed himself. The following steps are distinguishable (in logic, if not in time):

a. The baby undertakes to feed himself with the spoon.

b. He strikes a difficulty. On the way to his mouth the spoon turns over and the food is spilled.
 Note the psychological nature of the difficulty. Baby does not have in his repertoire of available ways-of-behaving the particular response here needed. His mother has it. Older sister has it. Later on, he will have it, but now he does not have it. He must get this before he can go on successfully with his undertaking.

c. He tries again. Unless he varies, he can never learn, for to learn the right, he must eventually practice the right. Mother makes suggestions. He watches how she does it, then

tries it again himself, paying attention to spoon, food, and hand as he seeks the needed new way-of-behaving.

d. In the end he succeeds. He finds, gets, and applies the necessary way-of-behaving.

e. The undertaking, stopped in Step b, now goes forward. He feeds himself.

In this simple case we have the essence of learning, wherever found, of this second practical type. In this, we see how and why learning enters experience. A properly varied life-series of such learning experiences, each with its manifold learnings all going on under competent guidance, will make up the new curriculum.

From this analysis we are then ready to make a number of statements useful for a better understanding of this new conception of the curriculum.

1. We see, in general, how a practical step forward in life depends on learning. Hitherto, the baby could not feed himself. Through learning, he now henceforth can. Through learning, he has stepped forward.

2. We see under b (above) the very real need for learning, the actual demand for it. The intended activity was held up by a lack. Learning was, thus, necessary if the undertaking was ever to go forward.

3. We see in this concrete situation very practical definitions of 'study,' 'learn,' of subject-matter-of-study, subject-matter-of-learning.

'Study' is the effort under c to find and get the new way-of-behaving. The subject-matter-of-study included all the promising objects to which attention was paid during the study. This is the kind of study needed for the new curriculum.

'Learn' means finding and getting the new way-of-behaving. The subject-matter-of-learning is a new way-of-behaving. It is always so, even with school subjects. Spelling is a way of behaving, otherwise it is worthless. So with arithmetic, and even with history and geography. If these do not reappear as ways of behaving, they have not filled their purpose. This is the kind of learning needed in the new curriculum. We may note further that what is thus learned, the subject matter of the new curriculum, has three aspects which always go together, a 'mental' (the *how* side, the solution of

the problem), a 'physical' (the skill side), and a 'dispositional' (the propulsive tendency to do what had been learned).

4. We get in the activity itself a real test as to whether learning has taken place: Can and does the child behave in the new way? Does he successfully feed himself with the spoon? Does the activity once balked now go forward? This is the test that the new curriculum favors.

5. The mother's part played here gives us the inherent place and function of the teacher. What did the mother do? First, she noted when the child was by development and attitude ready for the undertaking of feeding himself and she encouraged him accordingly. If need be, she might take positive steps to start him on the undertaking. Second, she provided conditions favorable to success —a spoon easy to manage, suitable food, etc. Third, she watched his efforts and help in a way to facilitate his learning, directing attention to proper movements, applauding success, encouraging repetition, etc. These are the functions of the teacher in the new curriculum.

6. The relation of the race experience to the child's learning also here appears. The personal use of the spoon in eating is the new element in this situation. The child was already familiar with the spoon as mother's aid to his eating, and he had already seen others so feed themselves. The spoon and its uses belong to the race experience. The particular thing to be learned this day, the way of feeding one's self with a spoon as seen in others, served the learning baby in two ways. First, seeing others do it, he was at length stimulated to try it himself. Second, what he saw in actual operation furnished the model for imitation in his own efforts. These two functions the race experience typically performs: it stimulates the learner to attempt something new; it serves to guide his efforts in learning the new. As a contribution to the world's knowledge, the boy did not invent the plan of feeding himself with a spoon. He accepted it from the race experience. Yet as a personal way-of-behaving, he did, in a sense and in some degree, devise the necessary movements. Mother could not hand him the way of behaving as she could hand him the spoon. This he must—under guidance—make for himself. Through this appropriation of the race experience the child, as we see in the next item, grows as an individual, each such step typically leading to others. The new curriculum is

in this way always making dynamic use of the race experience, first as stimulus to the learner to try things new to him (and possibly new to the race), second as stuff to be used in devising his new ways.

7. In and from this experience the child moves forward in his career. He now takes over this much more of his own direction. He is less dependent on others. He is somewhat more of a personality. He feels more confidence in himself. Also, small though it seems to us, he has widened the range of his responsibilities. What he shall hereafter eat is now more in his hands. New moral obligations accordingly ensue. Moreover, new experiences open up, each with more or less its new problem, its new responsibility and new obligation. Life has been to some extent remade. Such remaking of life is the aim of education for the new curriculum, to give more content and more meaning, to give the learner more control in life and over life.

The Resulting Conception of the Educative Process

Out of the conceptions so far got, we have finally constructed a guiding notion of education as a whole. Education concerns itself with life, to make life better. To the discerning look education is not something outside of life, applied as a tool, a lever say, with which to push life forward or higher. No, education is inside of life, inherent in life, part of the very life process itself so far as life is worth while. Each step forward in living involves learning. To be worth while in itself, life must include learning. The zest of life is at the growing edge. Each significant learning experience in some measure remakes subsequent experience, in some measure gives a wider outlook as to the possibilities of life and deeper insight into its processes; gives also differentiated attitudes and appreciations with respect to the different new things seen and felt; gives also increased technique, power of control over the experience process, to bring it more under conscious direction. We have seen all of these things illustrated in so slight an instance as a baby learning to feed himself with a spoon. His life was in fact for him remade to an appreciable degree by his learning experience. The learning was in life and the learning was life. Involving change, the learning remade life, carrying it to a higher and richer level.

Education, then, is desirably such a process of living as remakes life. Remakes it not once nor occasionally at long intervals, but if possible continuously remakes it. So that each learning experience leaves the learner at once with a broader outlook, at once more disposed and better equipped to go on to further like fruitful experiences. This is what we mean by saying that education is such a process of associated living as continuously remakes life, carrying it always to higher and richer levels, not only for the individual, but also for all whom he influences. In this conception aim and process are united. It guides us forward while it bids us notice what is now going on. If the present learning experience be good, it is thus good not only for the present but also for the future. Education is the continuous reconstruction of life to ever higher and richer levels. This is the definition of education for the new curriculum.

The World We Live In and Its Lesson for Education

We have seen somewhat of how learning takes place. We have seen how learning properly enters life to remake it. In the conception of education as the reconstruction of life we have at length got a general statement of the aim of education as inherent in life itself. To give more detailed guidance it may be well to consider further the kind of world we now live in and ask what more definite lessons it has for us. For, if our curriculum is to do its part in remaking life, it must know actual life.

Our present world is a changing world. Never before has change been so persistent or so permeating a factor. Moreover, there is every promise that, rapid as change has been, it will be even more rapid in the future. Our young people face, then, an unknown future. Once education could merely repeat the past. That time has gone. Not that we should not now learn from the past. We have, if possible, even greater need to do so. But we must, in a new sense and degree, prepare our young people to hold their own in a changing world. Change must enter in a new sense and degree into our calculation. Education must know that we face an unknown and shifting civilization. This fact our curriculum must positively use.

The pressing problem is already different from what it was. Our problem once was nature. Now it is man. Till recently, the

problem of controlling nature so as to free man from economic want was modern man's chief concern. In this his success has been nothing short of marvelous. But his very success here raises the new problem. Is man wise enough and good enough to control what he has wrought? Already many deep-seated problems press on us. War, labor and capital, democratic government *vs.* dictatorship, the exploitation of so-called backward nations, race problems, over-population. Man's chief problem is now man himself.

What shall we teach in the light of these things? Not the answers to the problems. We cannot. We don't know the answers. More specifically, we do not as yet know even the problems, at least not in their determining details. No, our procedure must be different. Difficult as it is, our chief concern must be with more general things. Of all things now established, the utility of the experimental method and attitude is seemingly our surest hope. Using this as a basis, we must, if possible, build characters who can stand amid change, who are more intelligent as regards social matters, who can, and will, steer changes into better directions.

That these things may be done, we must work, in season and out, for such experiences as will build up our young people along these lines. As aids to us who are to guide the process, it may be well to list certain qualities that should in consequence increasingly characterize our growing youth. Among the qualities that I would myself name, assuming (as I do) that democracy is right, are strength of character, unselfish regard for the common good, sensitiveness to the significant values in life, open-mindedness, critical-mindedness, fruitful methods of attack, particularly upon social problems. Any such list but reveals its own omissions and limitations. If any object that the first three will assume some predetermined philosophy and that I am accordingly not truly experimental in my attitude, then I must rely on the last three to supply the correction. Further, these general terms must not close our eyes to the fact that such qualities are goals and summations of indefinitely many specific responses, each of which itself has to be built. Still further, if the earlier reasoning be correct, these qualities, both specific and general, cannot be taught directly. To seek them directly may well be to lose them. Such responses can only be built up in the individual as they are called out for him in the kind of experiences where they naturally belong. The good teacher will

know these qualities and know their value, will also know the kind of experiences most likely to call them out, and will have the knowledge and tact and skill necessary to guide every actual experience so as best to yield its proper outcomes. In such teaching may we hope that our new curriculum will function, as it should, to build intelligent characters suited to the times.

If any feel that there has here been too much insistence on the fact of change and too little attention to the preservation of the race experience, especially as this is embodied in knowledge and skill, two considerations may help to clarify the situation. First, as to change. Increasing change is a most serious fact. We dare not ignore it. We must learn how to deal with it. In order to solve the problem, our attack on it must be conscious, out in the open. Emphasis is at the present time necessary in order to secure the needed attention. Second, as to the race experience. This is, indeed, valuable beyond compare, but, as has already been implied, its value is instrumental and not primary. We keep it in existence, not for its own sake, but for its value to life. We teach knowledge and skills for their service in life. The conditions of true learning, that is for appropriation in life for life, seem, as set out above, to demand that subject matter be taught, typically if not exclusively, when and as it is needed in order to carry on some enterprise which the learner (preferably in a group with others) has then under way. Such enterprises, while always including the thought aspect, will with the very young perhaps usually show an emphasis upon motor activity. With increasing age the successive enterprises (activities, problems, projects, experiences of whatever kind) will increase in social outlook and in thought content. Any teacher who has worked primarily with problems rather than with the fixed content of the ordinary textbooks will testify that the quantity of knowledge thus brought into play is far and away greater than any textbook writer would dare place in his book. The plan of teaching subject matter as it is needed seems, if reasonably directed, to promise not less, but more and better learning of both skill and knowledge—not the loss of the race experience, but its most intelligent presentation.

Ideals and Practical Logic

A word or two may be in place about the logic underlying the position here presented, especially as to how ideals and actualities

are to be reconciled in a practical procedure. Any problem will involve considerations which more or less oppose each other. This opposition exactly creates the difficulty and constitutes the problem. One set of considerations tells us to go in one direction, while another set, if allowed their way, would carry us elsewhere. The solution is the best way of dealing with the opposed demands. To such a problem there are several different kinds of solution possible. One kind is to choose one side and reject the other. Another is to compromise, giving part to one side and part to the other. Still another is to get rid of the conflict (or at any rate shift the problem) by seeing things in a new light.

We can illustrate all three types of solution by the age-old problem of the mutual adjustment of men and human institutions to each other. Some have seen here only clear-cut conflict in which one side or the other must yield totally. Parties have thus arisen. One party has proposed to abandon any control by institutions and let the individuals decide each for himself what he will do. The opposed party, scandalized at this plan, has proposed instead the other extreme. Existing institutions are to be retained and obeyed at all costs. Men must fit in or be broken. Clearly neither extreme solves the problem. Each in its way unjustly submerges the personality of at least some concerned. The practical world has customarily compromised. At least till recent historic times, it has held as much as it well could to existing institutions and has demanded as much as it could that men fit them. No conscious program of adjustment has obtained. Suppose we now try to shift the problem by seeing the conflicting elements in a new light.

Let us think of both institutions and men as open to change and note the corresponding changes in the problem. If of institutions we say that they exist only to help people live well together and should be changed, if need be, so as to help people live better together (and then see in history that such changes, while slow, have still all the while been going on), clearly the problem is definitely shifted. We are now willing to change institutions, and we have a criterion for doing so. If at the same time we say of man and human nature that observed education and the diversity of customs together show that man's nature is very plastic, that he has very wide limits within which he can express himself, then our original

problem is still further shifted. With these changes of conception, we now ask how can we conjointly so change our institutions and at the same time so educate man that the present conflicts may continuously be lessened to a minimal degree. We do not need, then, to make a clear-cut choice between two irreconcilable fixed elements (to choose either would leave the problem unsolved), nor need we have a compromise which might lessen the conflict in degree but still give no hopeful program. Instead, we have now a promising program. We must on the one hand study into the working of institutions so as to improve them, and on the other hand study into human nature and its education so that each individual may progressively adopt the defensible social order as the only sure expression of human personality.

Two conceptions enter here, and generally, to make such a problem more amenable to thought and consequently to control. The first is to see the conflicting elements, not as fixed and final, but as changeable, as variables that change according as certain controllable factors are properly directed. The other is the conception of continuity, which provides for gradual change. In large social matters the best we can hope for is improvement, not by jumps, but by degrees, whereby the present bad state of affairs changes gradually into a better state of affairs as thought and effort are properly applied. A world of continuity with elements that are variable—these are the characteristics of a dynamic philosophy. The resulting world is accordingly plastic to thought and effort. The consequent shift of problems from a state of hopeless theoretical conflict to a hopeful working program is exactly the excellence of the logic here presented.

The Practical Situation

How Shall We Conceive It?

The logic just discussed may help us to deal with the curriculum problem.

Of the many issues involved in this complex problem possibly the most crucial one for practice is as to whether the curriculum shall be made in advance. We have at once two groups. Let us state the extremes. The older party, at present holding control of the administrative fortress, says emphatically: The curriculum

must be made in advance and handed out else your teaching will utterly fail, the work will be fatally haphazard. The other party, in proportion better represented perhaps among teachers and theorists, says: If you make your curriculum in advance and so hand it out to your teachers and thus require a set schedule of educational outcomes, the teaching must fail to educate. Properly educative experiences cannot be so ordered in advance as to yield designated outcomes, let alone be ordered months in advance. As stated in these extremes, each side seems to be thinking of the matter as an 'all-or-none' kind of affair. Either the curriculum is to be totally made in advance and handed out complete for all teachers, or it is not to be made in advance in any degree for or by anybody.

It is at once more than doubtful that the issue need be as sharp or as sweeping as here contrasted. Considering some teachers and some places as they now are, would not even the latter extreme opposition admit that better results would probably ensue for them if the best available outside thought would devise a required curriculum for their use? As to the other extreme, are there not other teachers so intelligently capable and so experienced that any probable outside prescription would handicap their teaching? Certainly, most university professors so hold for themselves in their work. It would therefore seem *a priori* probable that at least some elementary or secondary teachers might similarly qualify. If these be granted of the extremely poor and the extremely good teachers, surely the principle of continuity holds in between, and there will be found all intermediate degrees on a scale of present affairs where rigid making-in-advance yields gradually to the possibility of more and more teacher-class control in the matter. The opposed sides to the controversy might differ as to how the teachers of the country actually and potentially distribute themselves on this scale, but surely they would agree on the existence of the scale and that, if we knew the facts, on such a scale the present state of affairs is actually distributed.

Let us now take this distribution scale and look to the future. Those who hold to the idea that the teacher and class should in the end control curriculum-making—would not these, facing the facts of this distribution, have to admit that at best we should move the lower end up the scale gradually rather than suddenly? And

should not any such move be made, at least at first, on a voluntary basis, letting those try it who wish? For the advocates of this side, surely the only answer to both questions is 'yes.' Consider now the other side, those who say the curriculum must as a rule forever be made in advance. If this is to be accepted as a fact, surely its truth ought to be shown by fair experimentation. On no other basis ought those of us who do not now believe it to be asked to give up our opinion. And would not such experimentation have to take place all up and down this line, for even on this theory at least a different amount or kind of prescription might prove wise for one end of the distribution from what would hold of the other. Such experimentation up and down the line need not mean that all schools should so experiment; but it might be wise, at least at first, to select the experimenting schools on a volunteer basis, letting those try it who would. It seems, then, that both sides can reasonably agree, not only as to the existence of this scale distribution, but also that experimentation for those who wish it should be allowed, under proper safeguards, to determine what varying degrees of making-in-advance or its opposite may after all be best.

For myself, I believe the ideal is not to make the curriculum in advance, but for the sake of the cause itself I should oppose to the utmost having all the schools in the country suddenly shift tomorrow to that actual basis. They are not ready for such a step. Moreover, speaking for myself, I do not now know what kind or degree of prepared-in-advance material will finally be best. I think the answer can only come out of wide experimentation. Similarly, for many techniques of class management, for textbooks, and for many other matters. The point of view under consideration is yet too new. We must experiment widely and that means we must move gradually.

The proposal that I make, then, is that we start where we are—there is nowhere else to begin—and move as fast and as far as we can toward the ideal plan, trying things out as we go, letting the results properly interpreted determine our solution to the problem.

How the ideal plan is compounded of many factors, each of which makes its own demand, and how the solution of the problem thus created is to be sought, is the next matter for discussion.

Some Factors To Be Considered

As we face all the varied factors that have been shown to be involved in curriculum-making and all the varying degrees in which these present themselves, it is easy to conclude that we need hardly seek one universal solution to the curriculum problem, at least not soon. It seems wiser and truer to the facts to recognize certain ideals and to work for these as far as they can reasonably be attained in conjunction with each other and in the face of hindering conditions. As we face these ideals, it need occasion no surprise to find among them some so related that a problem results as to how to get more of one without losing somewhat of another. Maximal pupil responsibility and optimal organization of learning results may thus find difficulty in walking hand-in-hand. This is but part of the abiding complexity of our problem. As to the hindrances, we shall, looking to the future, seek to lessen their power as much and as fast as feasible, but meanwhile they are to be given due weight in our decisions as to what we shall now attempt. It is as much a matter of wisdom and of consequent duty not to overlook present hindrances as it is of original duty to lessen ultimately the hindrances and so better attain the ideals. Solving the problem faced at any one time means thus finding that course of action which, all things considered, promises best for the present and for the future.

In order to judge what course is best we must have some basis of judging. It is, however, difficult to secure widespread agreement upon any one unifying aim as a basis of judging. It seems, then, but fair to state that the inclusive aim here accepted, so far as one such aim may be stated, is that we seek to bring *continued growing* to all concerned. If we can think of one instance or sample of life as better than another, then "growing," as here used, means such change in one as makes for this better living, better not only for the individual, but also at the same time for all others whom he influences. And life is here counted good as it is positive and active rather than merely passive or negating; positive and active along such lines as encourage and make possible further and varied positive and active living in all concerned. It is growing of this kind that is here set up as the inclusive aim in our educational efforts.

To facilitate the practical carrying out of this conception of solving the curriculum-problem, it may help to list some of the

more important factors that must be held in mind as each curriculum-maker faces his own particular situation, whatever it may be. The list here given is not meant to be complete, but rather a distributed sample of the kinds of things that must be considered, both of things to be desired and of hindrances. That the several factors in any situation will have differing weights for that situation goes without saying. Some of these factors more immediately concern the teacher. Other factors will more concern others working on the problem.

The following are factors to which each curriculum-maker should be duly sensitive. The additional qualifying remarks in connection seem necessary in order to make an adequate statement of their implications.

1. Each learner should work reasonably near to the limit of his power and resources at enterprises which he feels in maximal feasible degree to be his own and for which he accepts responsibility.

This, it is expected, will supply the intent and practice needed for learning.

That best thinking is an "intellectual adventure" and "an adventure into the unknown" is an important element here.

To work, as here desired, will rather emphasize than deny the need for variety in work as well as for rest and recreation.

Drill should as far as feasible come because the need for it has been seen and felt in connection with such enterprises.

2. Regard should always be had for the fact that learning is never single and due attention must be paid to making the attendant learnings as wholesome as possible.

This the older curriculum theory tends to disregard.

3. As far as feasible, learning should take place in a situation of 'natural' connectedness.

Due effort must, of course, be made at the right time that learning be properly generalized.

This connectedness will mean that most learning must be in a social setting. It should, furthermore, be such as to make, on the one hand, for continuity of learning in a life unity and, on the other, for a unified self amid varying experiences.

4. Learning enterprises or experiences should so increase in social content and in organization as to mean optimal progress both

in social integration and in the organization of experiences for the control of further experience.

It is thus meant on the one hand to avoid 'fooling' and mere repetition and on the other to make suitable use of the race experience.

Teacher control and all pre-arrangement of subject matter should be considered as means to this end.

5. Practice in socialization as well as considerations of finance alike demand that children be educated largely in groups.

6. On the one hand, curriculum-making cannot disregard administrative feasibility. On the other hand, administration itself exists exactly in order to make the curriculum (and the whole educative process) a success.

7. As far as feasible, the teacher should ascertain, preferably by comparable objective tests, what growing is being achieved by the pupils under his care.

This is primarily to furnish help to the teacher for the better direction of the work at hand, secondarily to help other like teachers and to furnish, in general, data for further and wider study of education.

Great care is necessary that testing should not, as too often it has done, so act as to shift the teacher's endeavor into narrow and wrong lines. This danger is the greater because, so far, we can measure better the more mechanical types of outcomes.

While for some purposes it is wise to let pupils know the results of their testing, education is in very truth perverted if passing tests be allowed to become the main end either of study or of teaching.

8. The work of the school should be so conducted as to encourage and reward work and growth on the part of teachers as truly as of pupils.

The preparation of material by 'experts' for the use of teachers should thus be the kind that tends to increase and not lessen the opportunity and responsibility of teachers to think and act constructively.

This encouragement is probably our main reliance for drawing persons of high quality into the teaching profession.

9. At any one time there will be certain hindrances which for the time are beyond control. These must be given due consideration.

Among such present hindrances are textbooks as at present made, conventional requirements, whether found in college entrance conditions, in state prescriptions, or in popular prejudices, the ordinary classification and promotion schemes, present habits and outlooks of teachers. How controllable these may or may not be will, of course, vary from place to place and time to time.

In the light of such factors as the foregoing nine must each curriculum-maker decide on the present solution of his immediate curriculum-problem. To bring also a better day he should continuously work as much as he can in the spirit of the ideals sought and strive meanwhile to lessen the hold of the hindrances. Here will and skill each help to strengthen the other. So it was two generations and more ago when teachers thought whippings necessary to maintain discipline and secure effort. Certain adventurous souls, catching the vision of better things, dared lessen the sway of the rod and so to teach. As skill in doing without the rod increased, the will to do so likewise grew. This in turn brought more skill, and each in turn strengthened the other till we now wonder at those earlier days. So again, I, for one, dare hope it will be with our curriculum-making. Already many point the way to better things. Already does growing skill increase the will abroad to give to teacher and pupil a better and truer part in the educative process. And this must be the road to better things.

A Concluding Word

It need hardly be pointed out that the curriculum-problem as here conceived is different from that of certain other contributors to this volume. The discussion here given has been restricted largely to the form and function of the curriculum with but little attention given to content as such. This is not to deny the value of search into the content, if made at the proper time, but it is to question the logical propriety or the practical wisdom of more than tentative work here until certain prior matters have first been settled. It surely is not right to try to make a curriculum out and out before we know how a curriculum can and should function. If the answers here given to these prior questions should prove correct, then much of the 'scientific' procedure is ruled out or relegated

to a distinctly inferior position. It cannot, then, be said that nothing is at stake.

The traditional conception of the function of the curriculum seems on the face of it not to fit either modern psychology or modern social philosophy. Some of our best students seem willing not to question the traditional assumptions. It is as much to force attention to this prior question as to present my answer that this paper has been written.

Criticism of the General Statement

In the light of the foregoing statement of theory it is desirable to review the General Statement in order to comment upon certain features of it. To facilitate reference, the comments will be numbered and precise reference will be given to the paragraph criticized.

1. In Paragraph 5 the word "stage" may be ambiguous. I wish specifically to reject the doctrine that there are distinct periods, with psychologically defined beginnings and endings. Any arbitrary division of life, say into three-year periods or into seven-year periods, would meet the sense of the paragraph as I understand it.

2. In Paragraph 6 near the close, the word "subsequent" refers for me not simply or primarily to situations of adult life, but rather to subsequent situations in general including those immediately subsequent.

3. Section III (Paragraphs 12-15) can too easily—for my satisfaction—be taken to imply the customary notion of curriculum-construction, only here placed on a scientific basis. I do not think the words as written necessarily mean this, though quite possibly their specific author so meant them. Still, however, even if the words be so interpreted, the procedure thus advocated would be such an improvement upon the general American practice as to warrant endorsement as a next practicable step. In that case I should myself wish that the step be merely transitional.

In this connection, one further word: It is all right to use scientific methods to determine, say, the fifty most important cities in the world. Such is undoubtedly a contribution to knowledge. But after this has been done we still have untouched, to my notion, the curriculum-problem of how to use the facts so established. The

same seems to hold of most other similar statistical determinations. They are at best but the raw materials of curriculum-content.

4. Paragraph 25 is, I think, needlessly involved and obscure. In my judgment it should read somewhat as follows:

> But in recent years we have come increasingly to recognize that for life-purposes learning has not really taken place until an actual new way of behaving has been incorporated into the learner's life and character.

5. In Paragraph 26, the word "behaving" has been needlessly sacrificed. The best term is surely "ways-of-behaving." We must not taboo the term "behavior" because we do not approve of "behaviorism."

6. Paragraph 28 is a remarkably forward-looking statement. I congratulate the Committee on accepting it. I should be proud to have formulated it.

7. In discussing Paragraph 29 as originally written, the Committee found an irreconcilable difference of opinion which had finally to go unmentioned. We could not agree on any statement. As now written, the paragraph avoids the issue. The matter cuts so deep that I wish to comment upon it. The question was on the nature of organization and the relation of the learner to it. One position seemed to be that organization exists prior to, and independent of, any learning and that it is the work of education to get the learner to appropriate this already waiting organization. This position so understood I reject, first as not being true to the facts and second as being the philosophical position originally devised by those who wish to place human institutions above and beyond change and to subordinate individual men thereto. Actually, the pertinent facts seem to be as follows: There are organizations made by men of varying kinds for varying purposes. All of these, so far as I know, are subject to change. (I refer here to the organization itself, not to the facts organized. Elsewhere we might discuss the nature of facts.) Even the long accepted law of gravitation is now doubtful. As to any one matter, each individual thinker of whatever age or advancement makes the organization which he himself uses. Good or bad, that is his organization. He may use the same words as does another, but the psychological content will vary with the individual. No two men, for example, have the same notion of

'horse.' Nor is even the multiplication table organized into the minds of any two men in exactly the same way. In making any organization each learner will be influenced by the organizations of others which he finds at work along that line. Each learner must, of course form the best working organization that he economically can, and this will usually approximate the best that the best of the race has devised for that purpose.

Probably the most significant point of difference in this for us shows itself in the opposed attitudes toward learning. One party seems to think typically of learning as primarily the conscious and accurate appropriation of fixed-in-advance material set out to be so learned. The other position looks typically upon learning as the changes in ways of behaving (intellectually, emotionally, bodily) brought about as the learner tries actively to cope with a confronting situation. The latter position, in my judgment, better fits the modern world of progress and democracy, with its appropriate dynamic psychology and dynamic logic. The other position (as I understand it) better fits the once prevalent effort to keep practical change within the narrowest possible limits and to deny theoretical change altogether in the realm of ideals, with a corresponding psychology and logic appropriately consistent. As I saw the discussion, certain of the committee accepted one of these positions and others the other, while some inconsistently followed partly one and partly the other. These varying attitudes are, I think, reflected in the report.

8. Paragraph 30 recalls the discussion given just above. Some words seem too much to imply that the learning outcomes can and should be known in advance. On the static position discussed just above, the teacher should be able, in the degree that the pupil is both docile and capable, to know in advance what the outcomes are to be. On the dynamic position, however, as a rule, the more educative an experience proves in the end to be, the more truly was it for the learner an adventure into the unknown. To be sure, the proportion of known and unknown will vary from occasion to occasion and from person to person. Too much unknown would mean failure and possible discouragement. Too little would mean fooling and vain repetition. It may surprise some to think that the same holds also for the teacher. Each experience of the class is also an

experience for him. If there be too much unknown to him in what the class (and he) undertake, failure and discouragement for him threaten. If too little, then no learning and drudgery are consequently probable. Moreover, he will teach better, be more sympathetic, be more interesting, more inspiring—and his students will learn more—if he himself consciously feels that he does not know all that will come out of the experience, either to the pupils or to himself. The dynamic point of view which approves 'adventure' and respects personality seems the best road to interest and learning to all concerned. In fact so significant is this for democracy, both ethically and psychologically, that we seem warranted in asserting that a consistent democracy will accept no other kind of learning as typical.

9. Paragraph 31 is a rather good statement for a composite group to make. It may be well to warn some who read with as yet unopened eyes that it is susceptible of two interpretations. Either interpretation is an advance upon the average practice, but, properly viewed, the paragraph fits the road of adventure remarkably well.

10. Paragraph 32 is very true, though the curriculum-problem still remains unsolved as to how to use the material so organized as best to forward true learning. Again, valuable as such organizations may be, they are typically only the raw materials of curriculum-construction.

11. Paragraphs 34-36 furnish another instance of needlessly involved statement. If the reader will ignore them and begin with Paragraph 37 he will get, in my opinion, a better picture both of the facts and of the argument. If I had myself been writing the paragraph, I should have avoided the appearance of restricting the applications to "industrial, political, and social life." However, broadly interpreted, these are perhaps sufficiently wide to include everything. The point is that our school 'subjects' were artificially made for the purposes of sophisticated adult criticism. Grammar, for example, as a subject of study and thought had not even begun to be until long after literature had achieved the height of the Iliad. Learning properly takes place in a natural life-setting. Unless artificially hindered, it therefore pays no attention to subject-division lines, but follows the relationships of the natural setting.

Paragraphs 38-39 may also be ignored without great hurt, the real matter being found in Paragraphs 40 and 41. Here I am myself a bit troubled. If the discussion of Paragraphs 42 and 43 be accepted, we shall have new 'subjects,' but made for teaching purposes, not from considerations of logic as were the old. This should prove an interesting experiment and as a transition step at least may well be approved. I, myself, think, however, that even this will prove too restrictive to the finer technicians who are to follow us.

12. Section IX has too tame a heading even for the moderate advance taken in the discussion. The term 'reconstruction' would fit better. As a next step—transitional, I hope, to a better conception—the general discussion is to be approved. There is naturally too much implication that one whole curriculum is to be made which all will then follow. The releasing of efficient teachers, while good as far as it goes, implies to my mind a very inadequate conception of the place of the teacher (and class) in relation to the curriculum.

13. Section X forms a definite advance which should be preached in season and out. The harm that has been done in the state and out by the New York Regents examinations is, in my judgment, very, very great. However, the logic of this condemnation goes farther, I suspect, than appears on the surface. The whole conception of a fixed-in-advance curriculum is by logical implication at least made questionable.

14. Paragraph 52 is good as far as it goes. It might, however, be argued that the teacher training institution should "teach" (in the open-minded sense) the best theory it knows, "teaching" meanwhile the modifications necessary to be made to meet the varying actual conditions that present themselves.

15. Section XII, again, too much assumes throughout that the curriculum will be made in advance and handed down from above. Various conscience clauses, however, were introduced to release dissenters so that the opponents of this orthodoxy felt it proper to accept the inclusion of the section as in fact proposing improvements over what now prevail.

CHAPTER XI

CURRICULUM-MAKING: POINTS OF EMPHASIS

HAROLD RUGG
Teachers College, Columbia University

I

It is now four months since the Curriculum Committee of the National Society completed the General Statement. I have just reviewed it carefully. I find myself in substantial agreement with it.

The statement, however, is a joint product, the result of attempting to reconcile divergent theories. Hence it has tended to flatten out peaks of emphasis which, in the statement of personal positions, stand out more or less boldly. In the theory of any person, the problems of curriculum-making do not assume equal importance. Certain ones emerge with life-and-death insistence; others drop into the background. Like most of my colleagues, therefore, in signing the General Statement, I welcome this opportunity to make a few crucial matters emerge sharply from the more or less coördinate plane upon which our joint writing has appeared to set them.

My thinking about the school curriculum and its construction is concerned most with six of the problems discussed in the General Statement. Stated dogmatically these are:

First: That it is not refinement of existing 'subjects' that is most sorely needed; it is rather, the radical reconstruction of the entire school curriculum.

Second: That the most fundamental basis of the reconstruction will be a comprehensive and scientific study of society. The study of adult society *alone,* however, will prove to be only a partial basis. Sound reconstruction will take equal cognizance of the interests and doings of children.

Third: That one of the most needed first steps in reconstruction is a new synthesis of knowledge and a re-departmentalization of the activities and materials of the school curriculum.

Fourth: That with the growing momentum of the movement for the construction of a child-activities curriculum, the central rôle of

the printed word shall not be missed and that a thorough-going vivification of the materials of instruction be instituted.

Fifth: That because of current administrative handicaps, the curriculum must be planned in outline form in advance; it can not be made 'on the spot.'

Sixth: That the tasks of curriculum-making are manifold and difficult and can be carried on effectively only by professionally equipped specialists.

II

First, the dictum that what is needed is a radical rebuilding of the curriculum, not the mere refinement of existing subjects. In one of the original drafts of the General Statement, the need for thorough reconstruction was definitely stated. In the give and take of our discussion, however, the notion of continuous and comprehensive *con*struction was substituted for the emphasis upon *re*-construction.

I agreed heartily with the latter implication: namely, that school men should visualize the task of curriculum-making as a continuous one and that the construction of any unit of the curriculum should always be carried out through a comprehensive view of the whole.

I disagreed sharply, however, with the notion that the *existing* content of the curriculum does really deal directly and vigorously with the crucial forces, institutions, and problems of American civilization. In contrast to my point of view, another minority of the group maintained that all that was needed was revision and refinement of the existing materials.

In so far as their contention dealt with the recent improvements in the content and organization of the skills of the elementary school, namely, much of the work of reading, arithmetical computation, spelling, map location, and handwriting, I agreed. At that point, indeed, the next practicable step *is* the revision and refinement of content, grade-placement, and organization by the systematic application of the latest scientific findings. With respect to the skills, I say, the task *is refinement and improvement.* That is so chiefly because the scientific movement has recently provided an objective foundation for the proposed new content and arrangement in these fields.

But we confront a totally different situation with respect to that portion of the school curriculum which deals with individual and social behavior, the so-called "content" phases of the course of study. The most striking characteristic of the contemporary situation is the enormous gap between the curriculum and the content of American life. I am convinced that the current American scene so nearly approximates an impasse that we are warranted in concentrating much of our effort upon the obliteration of that gap.

In Section I of Part I of this Yearbook I have discussed the difficult conditions under which America is experimenting with democratic government: her huge territory, the heterogeneity of race and culture among her people, the fatigue and ignorance dominating home life, the prevalence of suspicion and misunderstanding among the cliques into which the population is divided, etc.

I shall not repeat the argument here, merely contenting myself by referring the reader to the other volume.

First and foremost, I say, the rift between curriculum and society must be bridged.[1] The content of the school must be constructed out of the very materials of American life—not from academic relics of Victorian precedents. The curriculum must bring children to close grip with the roar and steely clang of industry, with the great integrated structure of American business, and must prepare them in sympathy and tolerance to confront the underlying forces of political and economic life. Young America must awake to the newly emerging culture of industrialism and she must become articulate.

We must discover a sane method by which useless subject matter can be discarded from the school curriculum and, instead, major problems, institutions, and modes of living that are of social importance utilized and taught in the lowest school grades commensurate with the mental abilities and experiences of children.

Especially is the hiatus great between school and life in those aspects of the curriculum which we have come to call the social studies and in their correlate, the culture materials. There is slowly emerging from the chaos of the new industrialism the faint outlines of a unique and virile American culture. There are, similarly,

[1] I am adapting in this chapter several paragraphs from an article of mine recently published in the *Teachers College Record*, March, 1926.

definite economic and political forces shaping the destiny of our people. These must all be brought into the curriculum.

How, for example, can the peoples of the world master the art of coöperation unless schools teach their youth true understanding of one another? They cannot, unless vivid pictures are supplied of the way people live in different parts of the earth, unless voluminous narratives are given of the manner by which eight hundred million human beings evolved our fragile Great Society, and unless much consideration is given to the critical treatments of its problems and issues.

Now it cannot be said that the current American school curriculum is so constituted. For example, consider the textbook exposition of the British Empire: little England's control of four hundred million people, how she secured it and why she maintains it at staggering cost; the strategic rôle of her huge resources in coal, iron, and oil and their significance in world politics; her exploitation (in company with the other great industrial nations) of Asia, and the gathering revolt of East against West. Is this thrilling and stupendous drama adequately staged in existing courses? Well, current geographies give an average of five pages to the British Isles; nothing to the Empire. So it is with the other sore spots of the world. Consider the wealth of understanding young people will obtain from three pages on awakening Russia—Russia, the dominant bloc of Eurasia!

The method of the encyclopedia dominates also the treatment of our insistent domestic problems. Seven pages to immigration. A chapter to the westward movement. Thirty paragraphic pages to the problems of American industry and business. Not only is the treatment of critical matters inadequate and brief, but its emphasis is on form and structure—not on the driving forces of American life. If space were at hand, illustrations could be multiplied without end to show the equal necessity for substituting a great wealth of meanings from the whole range of cultural, economic, and political life in place of the abbreviated, paragraphic exposition of superficial forms.

So much for my first point of emphasis, namely, that radical reconstruction—not refinement and revision—is urgently needed.

III

The second issue which should be brought out boldly is: To what extent shall the content and arrangement of the curriculum be determined by the interests and natural activities of children or by the criterion of preparation for adult life.

Since the time when Francis Parker first scandalized the Puritan scholastics that has been the nub of educational controversy.

I can make my own position clear at the start, perhaps, by pointing out the *coördinate* position of these two factors. An extreme emphasis upon either one of these two fundamental elements of the educative process will constitute merely an inadequate basis for curriculum-construction. The orientation of the curriculum-maker must be comprehensive enough, therefore, to include in its perspective both institutional life and the growing child.

Which of the two should be named first, which shall precede, is a question that is impossible of answer. For neither one nor the other precedes. Neither alone can dictate the curriculum.

An orientation, however, which will encompass child interest and adult society will produce a sound foundation for the school curriculum: a synthesis as broad as all of human living. Indeed, as the General Statement says (Par. 8): "The curriculum-maker is compelled to decide what use he shall make of the present needs, interests, and activities of children, on the one hand, and of the results accruing from the scientific study of society on the other."

Now, to me, the real nub of the matter is expressed in the next sentence: "The data from adult life will go far to determine what is of permanent value; the data from child life will go far to determine what is appropriate for education in each stage of the child's development."

With the inclusiveness of this statement I am in hearty agreement. For forty years, however, the formative agencies in education have focused their programs of reconstruction either upon the growth of the child and the utilization of his dynamic interests, or upon the standardization of administrative machinery. Both of the chief groups which have directed the reconstruction of the curriculum—the "free" educationists on the one hand and the university professors (with their "committee reports" and their school textbooks) on the other—have failed to give the deeper forces

nderlying American civilization a vital place in the picture. 'evertheless, these very forces constitute one of the two great foci pon which educational reconstruction must be swung.

Now, in part at least, the emphasis of the advocates of a freer ype of education—Parker, Dewey, Kilpatrick, to mention only a ew outstanding protestants—was due to their irritation at the niversal worship of academic and adult forms of behavior. Beause of their great anxiety that the school should pay much attenion to the interests, abilities, and learning processes of the child, the roponents of freedom have tended to minimize or even to ignore he second great factor in the educative process; that is, the end oint of growth—the problems, forces, and institutions of individual nd social life in adult society. The university scholars, indeed, gnored both of these vital factors and concentrated their effort upon erpetuating an academically founded knowledge and upon securng a nebulous product called "mental discipline." Because of this endency for curriculum-makers to ignore the directive influences f adult society, I should have preferred to give it a much greater mphasis in our General Statement.

In reality, the meanings, institutions, trends, and forces of conemporary society constitute no less than the steering machinery of ur educational program. The fundamental purpose of the chool is to guide the child from infancy to adulthood. Efficient uidance is predicated upon clear knowledge of the end points of ducation. Now, the true end point consists of a dynamic and well-eveloped personality endowed with an understanding of himself nd of social life, and imbued with a desire not only to live his own fe on the highest plane of effectiveness but also to contribute to ıe raising of the general level of the social group of which he is part. A focal aspect of this ideal end point, therefore, is a vivid, ropulsive understanding of American life.

I am confident that educational theorists will agree that the ındamental aim of education is maximal child growth at minimal xpense. Growth along the line of maximal ascent is the guiding urpose of instruction.

Now, the fuller life in adult society will be that in which the ıpacities for creative self-expression have been developed to the ighest point in each individual. Hence we shall guarantee that in

each year of his education, the child shall meet situations which will draw him *out* to the fullest extent—situations, however, that will also draw him *on* toward a rich understanding of the maturing life in which he is engaging.

What I firmly believe, therefore, is that we need a vigorous agitation concerning the problem of *understanding American life.* Both the "free" educationist and the academician have minimized or ignored it altogether. The former has been so concerned with child activities that he has most often failed to define clearly the goals toward which his creative curriculum is designed to take the child. The latter, the academician of our universities, has no doubt subscribed to the doctrine of preparing youth for adult life. But the curriculum which he has provided has failed throughout a century to deal courageously and intelligibly with the vital problems of personal and social life. In my judgment the steering of our curriculum-making machinery, therefore, needs a more comprehensive vision than either of these educational agents can offer.

There is no conflict, I say, between child interests and abilities and the study of society; both must play a part in the selection and validation of the activities and materials of instruction. Child interests and abilities determine organization, arrangement, order, and treatment. Societal analysis determines the broad scope of the total content—whether materials shall be included or excluded from the environment with which children are surrounded. The study of the propulsive forces of contemporary civilization and their growth and trends, together with knowledge of child learning and growth, can provide a sure orienting vision of the direction in which pupil activity, classroom discussion, what not, should steadily be moving. Constantly, while the learner is expanding through the most vivid and creative activity which the school can stimulate, the teacher's attention will be flexing between the utilization of the child's creative activities and the hoped-for outcomes in adult society. On the one hand, teaching must be alert in all stages of the school to maintain as much of naivete in self-expression as it is humanly possible to preserve. On the other hand, it shall also strive constantly to cut down, so far as it is possible, the gap between child development and a vivid appreciation of American life.

IV

To sum up the comments of the foregoing sections: Our first point of emphasis was that it is not refinement of the existing 'subjects' that we need; rather, it is thorough-going rebuilding. The second was that the new curriculum structure shall be erected upon an equal utilization of child life and adult society. In the discussion so far a vigorous emphasis has been laid upon the central importance of *understanding.*

Now, the difficulty of developing adequate understanding of our current complicated society brings me to the third of the needed emphases in curriculum-making; that is, that one of the first steps to be taken in the educational reconstruction is a new synthesis of knowledge and a re-departmentalization of the activities and materials of the school. America is an integrated welter of forces; essentially it is a unit. It must be studied *in toto.* It cannot be comprehended by studying its form separately or by considering, one at a time, the operations of its underlying forces, problems, and agencies. These forces, problems, and agencies—in part psychological, in part economic and political—are welded inextricably together: the ownership of land, the control of credit, industry, and trade, the standard of living, the fatigue of home life and the correlated mental attitudes of conformity and desire for social approval, the hierarchical organization of community life, the dazed indifference of the public and, strangely aloof from it all, a giant only half awake to its potentialities—the public school.

In spite of the need for studying our national order as a unit, curriculum-making in American schools has always been piece-meal. The materials of instruction from which children obtain their understanding of American life are presented in conventional subjects: history, geography, civics, economics, English, nature study, chemistry, what not. The subjects are narrow academic compartments of knowledge, representing bodies of technical facts and principles; they have been assembled for school use by specialists in subject matter. Their sponsors, those indeed who have constructed our curricula in the past, are experts in research, documentation, authentication. These techniques that they profess are essential for curriculum-making, but they play subordinate rôles. If one views American life as a whole, and in the light of the composition of the

curriculum of our great school system, one conclusion presses insistently: We must invent a new synthesis of knowledge and make it the basis of the entire school curriculum. The conventional barriers between the existing subjects must be ignored in curriculum-making. The *starting points* shall be the social institution, or the political and economic problem, and the capacities of children—not the subject. Psychological forces must oust economic and political form as the directing themes of organization.

Only one criterion should be permitted to dominate the organization of the materials of instruction: learning, not subject-matter sequence or authentication. We should ask constantly what facts and principles do young people need assembled in close relation in order to understand, and to practice themselves in reflection upon, American institutions and problems. What kinds of examples, episodes, graphic and pictorial presentations, problems, statistics, facts, do they need to comprehend the interdependence of the modern world, the problems of Americanizing millions of foreign-born, the wise use of coal, iron, oil, and land, the improvement of education, the culture of the American people? Certainly, to understand such matters they need data that are not now to be found in any one school subject. Hence the demand for a new deal—a new synthesis of knowledge.

Not only do we need a new synthesis of knowledge. We need to discover effective centers of child interest around which to organize the work of the school. The new synthesis of knowledge will be based, in part, upon the natural relationships of the facts and principles as they inhere in actual adult society. The effectiveness with which they are learned in the school, however, will depend upon our discovery of strategic activities which have a "maximum of lifelikeness to the learner." By experimentation, therefore, at all levels of the school we shall discover favorable activities in which children will engage naturally. It is the dynamic activities of children, real and lifelike, on the one hand, and the facts and principles of adult society arranged in natural juxtaposition, on the other, that will constitute the sound basis for the redepartmentalization of the school.

V

Throughout my discussion, much emphasis has been placed upon the need for not losing our balance because of enthusiasm for child

activities. The fourth point of emphasis, therefore, that I should like to make deals with the coördinate importance of reading and language in the school. In view of the growing momentum of the movement for the reconstruction of a child-activity curriculum, the central rôle of the printed word must not be overlooked. We are confronted by an insistent demand for a great change in the existing curriculum.

The materials of instruction, now thoroughly denatured of imaginative content, must become dramatic, vivid, compelling. Correspondingly, their volume must be much expanded. Especially is this important because of the implications of the foregoing comments. American life is enormously complicated and its ramifications are difficult to grasp. There are grave reasons for believing that it has reached an impasse and there is urgent necessity that large numbers of our people, particularly our youth, be led to comprehend it fearlessly and sanely.

Now, to the psychologist who confronts this task of the school honestly and unshrinkingly, the scope of contemporary civilization appears almost overwhelming. The school faces the task of building up in the minds and spines of children a huge array of meanings, concepts, generalizations, insights, and attitudes, to say nothing of the definite obligation to develop a mastery of needed skills. There is not time available from the moment the child enters the first school grade until he leaves at the eighth, ninth, or twelfth grade, to provide him with sufficient opportunity to build up an understanding of all the details of modern life. The school is compelled to select. We must discover a technique for bringing into conspicuous relationship the crucial institutions and psychological forces of our complex civilization.

A survey of the great range of learning-demands which comprise the curriculum reveals two principal modes by which people learn: they learn by repetition, and they learn through thrilling, gripping experiences. The skills needed in life are learned by repetition—practice of the most direct economical sort. But the far more difficult task of developing understanding compels the school to take recourse to the other great method of learning. Most of the materials of the school can be learned best in vivid human settings. The preponderance of the curriculum is highly personalized. For

example, history is a pageant dominated by the movement of personalities, stirring scenes of action, conflict, romance, human coöperation, conquest, and subjugation. The data of important world movements like those of the industrial revolution abound with gripping mind-pictures of people—their trials, difficulties, failures, and successes in the continued upward march of the standard of human living. Similar illustrations can be discovered in other departments of the school. The arts are replete with them. What would the literary course of the school be without the dramatic episode? What more effective route is there to develop sympathetic understanding than through poetry, autobiography, travel, personal diaries? And the romance of modern science supplies countless sensational examples of the vividness of life to-day.

I say that the method of the dramatic episode will become one of the chief vehicles from which such understanding shall emerge. The bare facts of the curriculum—dead, prosaic sorts of things—will be woven into vital accounts of the interplay of human beings upon each other. Concepts (for example, Nationalism, Democracy, Interdependence, the Standard of Living, Imperialism)—cues to understanding—acquire rich meanings only through the study of cases, episodes, concrete situations. The critical power of generalization, the basis of understanding the issues of modern life, will become part and parcel of the mental equipment of young people only by means of constant practice in drawing inferences and conclusions. Finally, young people will develop the capacity to comprehend abstract issues and problems only as they accumulate stores of meanings and concepts, and acquire facility in using them with generalizations.

VI

Somewhat recently, the protagonists of a more spontaneous type of education have propagated the doctrine that the curriculum should *not* be planned in advance; that it could only be made "on the spot." Basing education entirely upon the dynamic urges of childhood they have insisted that the curriculum shall grow out of the spontaneous interests and activities of children. Planning the curriculum in advance is, to these people, anathema. It is my firm conviction that there is no single person on our Committee who maintains this extreme view, although at the beginning of our ex-

change of views concerning the matter, the belief was rather vigorously expressed that, *so far as possible,* the curriculum should be evolved in the classroom from day to day. Nevertheless, the group eventually signed wholeheartedly the postulate concerning the need for a systematic outline of objectives and suggested pupil activities. In this case, as in dealing with other aspects of curriculum-making, the group reached its conclusions on the basis of the practical administrative conditions of to-day. The view that the curriculum should be made only on the spot postulates a genius-like teacher, endowed with intimate and exact knowledge of child life and development, broad vision of alternative lines of growth from childhood to social maturity, grasp of psychology, and rare skill in the management of pupils. The view is also based upon the premise of small teaching groups and the prolonged retention of pupils in school.

Now each of these premises is inappropriate to the contemporary situation. There is no reason to believe that the conditions which they imply can be brought about even in the course of the next generation. In spite of the striking advances of the last two decades, the great body of public-school teachers are not well trained students either of child learning or of society. Furthermore, instruction is carried on under the conditions of mass education with a wide range of individual differences. The hampering conditions of mass instruction in public schools, therefore, compel schools to aid the teacher by coöperating with her in the planning, at least in outline, of the proposed activities and the expected outcomes from the work of the school.

Those of our group who looked forward to a more radical reconstruction of the curriculum on the basis of child activity subscribed to the dictum more willingly because of the emphasis laid in it upon the dynamic outcomes from education. The statement says: "It is necessary that a teacher have at hand at any stage of his teaching an outline of the general attitudes, the finer appreciations, the important concepts and meanings, and the generalizations which he wishes to secure." In contrast to the universal practice of devoting major attention to the skills and knowledge, the statement projects a new emphasis upon the dynamic outcomes. I should stress, therefore, that the "course of study"—the technical name applied to

this outline-planned-in-advance—should state the outcomes of education in the form of intellectual and emotional traits which the school is to produce. For example, it is to produce *an attitude of tolerant understanding* of people, institutions, and forces in society, and of critical *appreciation of the fine and the beautiful.* It is responsible for developing a *vivid grasp of important concepts of social life and power to think about contemporary issues.* The only hope that these outcomes can be guaranteed, lies in their clear definition in the minds and vision of teachers. Furthermore, to be reasonably sure that instruction produces these outcomes, "the activities of childhood (including all the kinds of work we do in the school) should be planned in outline form in advance."

I was delighted that the group subscribed to that statement, for it seems to me that the "course of study" can serve its most imporant function as a guide to teachers by presenting to them for each grade or each level of the school suggested lists of activities, readings, topics for discussion, projects for individual and group research—indeed, the things that pupils can do.

I am convinced that the outstanding weakness of the laboratory schools is their very lack of outlines planned-in-advance. And it is the protagonists of the theories of laboratory schools who, more than others, have confused our thinking on this matter.

A propos of this problem, I interpret these phrases in the General Statement—"sequence of experiences" and "subject matter" —to mean that for the most effective use of school time and in order to guarantee maximal growth, the constructive social and creative activities as well as the correlative skills should be charted, written down, both in broad outline and in some detail. The end points of instruction in a given school, as for example, in the sixth or the eighth grade of elementary education, should not only be visualized by teachers but should also be stated in cold print in the school's "course of study." Surveys of recent practices in particular schools present convincing evidence that one of the chief weaknesses of "courses of study" is the lack of continuity in the respective grade programs; the lack of sure provision for steady development. Teaching units are planned quite in isolation, both for successive years and within grade curricula. The need in practical curriculum-making is for a charted picture of the whole scheme. This does not

mean, of course, that a rigid scheme of subject matter, that is, readings, problems, etc., will be given to the teacher to be learned verbatim by the pupils. It does mean, however, that in beginning her year's work, the teacher will have in hand an outline of suggested activities from which particular ones will be selected to fit the special needs of her class that year. It means, furthermore, that the list of activities from which she selects teaching units will have previously been analyzed so thoroughly that any one of them will give fairly sure promise of producing the needed outcomes.

I think, moreover, that I go farther than some of my colleagues in the degree to which I would assemble in "courses of study" for teachers fairly systematic schemes of basal and optional reading materials. The current organization of contemporary society is such that in all probability American schools must continue to make use of a large amount of reading. One of the most conspicuous advances in our generation is the increasing substitution of instruction in silent for oral reading and the marked improvement in the technique of teaching reading in the lower school. The gathering momentum of this new scientifically grounded movement will result, I believe, in a marked improvement in the level of adult understanding, even in the course of one generation.

The premise that American schools will rapidly increase the volume of reading done by young people points to a serious need for the preparation of a wealth of reading material which will introduce youth to vivid understanding of the current American scene. There is now a tremendous dearth of such material.

Furthermore, because American school communities are not yet convinced of the serious need of spending large sums of money upon reading libraries, the curriculum-maker has placed upon him the correspondingly greater obligation to assemble in convenient form graded schemes of reading material. I repeat, therefore, that not only would I plan in advance an outline of the great intellectual and emotional outcomes to be striven for in instruction, the suggested creative activities and processes through which those outcomes should be developed, but I should also provide the handicapped teacher in our thousands of small and inadequately equipped school systems with assembled and well-graded reading materials.

VII

Then comes a sixth point of emphasis upon which stress seems to me to be needed; the tasks of curriculum-making are manifold, difficult, and can be carried out only by professionally equipped specialists. These tasks include the determination of the ultimate and immediate objectives of education, and the experimental discovery of the most effective modes of selecting and organizing the activities of the respective grades of the school.

The tasks are indeed difficult. They can be managed only by persons of broad background, rich experience, and special training in the human and physical sciences; hence the validity of the generalization in our General Statement that "curriculum-making will increasingly utilize scientific procedure."

The point has already been made, for example, that in selecting the activities and other materials of instruction, the curriculum-maker must have a critical understanding both of childhood and of society. As for the latter, he must be a student of the problems and institutions of the modern world and of their evolution. He must master the rapidly accumulated mass of quantitative data dealing with industry, business, government, international relations, immigration, and a host of fundamental relationships concerning the physical and natural world. Curriculum-making will be based upon the synthesis of the keenest insights that he can discover concerning the trends of modern society and the reconstruction of its institutional life. I say, therefore, that the curriculum-maker must become a thorough student of society.

But if the selection and organization of curriculum-materials is to be wisely done, he must also become a student of learning, a master of the principles of child development. In the last two decades, we have witnessed the growth of a new and increasingly objective science of educational psychology. The very basis upon which the materials and activities of the school must be reorganized will be the principles and findings from the scientific study of learning, interests, general and special abilities, retardation, probable changes in the pupil population, anticipated occupational interests, etc.

Likewise, the curriculum-maker must solve a host of puzzling problems of grade-placement and organization. What activities,

readings, open forums, etc., will provide effective means of instruction at various ages? How can vivid reading interests be developed? How frequently should important concepts and generalizations recur? When should systematic practice in spelling, arithmetic, etc., be begun, and how should practice be distributed? These are a few typical examples from a huge array of difficult psychological questions which the curriculum-maker is called upon to answer. Certainly, they can not be answered except by persons of broad background, judgment, and through careful experimentation. Only by measured trial of alternative procedures can objective answers be produced to the questions of grade-placement and organization. The curriculum-maker must analyze and measure. He must be a master of the literature of the psychology of learning. In the present state of our ignorance concerning most effective methods of creating and organizing materials, it is imperative that the curriculum-maker base his tentative organization upon the best hypothesis which can be deduced from existing knowledge. The techniques of controlled experiment, measurement, and statistical condensation must constitute the equipment of those to whom is to be turned over the rebuilding of our school curriculum.

Finally, the curriculum must be made in the light of the known facts and principles of school administration—such matters as length of class exercise, size of classes, arrangements of school programs, range of individual differences, library facilities, laboratory and shop equipment, etc.

The General Statement, therefore, in my judgment should have made more emphatic the doctrine that curriculum-making demands the coöperation of several specialists. This generalization has hardly been grasped at all as yet. Nevertheless, each of the tasks is important. Each demands specialized equipment. The day is past in which a single individual—be he professor, teacher, administrator, psychologist, sociologist, or research specialist of whatever brand—can encompass all of these tasks singlehanded.

NOTE CONCERNING CHAPTERS XII AND XIII

In Chapters XII and XIII are presented selected quotations from the writings on the curriculum by Professor Dewey and by several leading Herbartians and their critics. More profoundly than others, the persons whose writings have been quoted (especially Professor Dewey) contributed to the formulation of the principles upon which the gradual reconstruction of the curriculum is being launched in our day.

For the selection and arrangement of the quotations the chairman of the Society's Curriculum Committee assumes full responsibility. The plan to include them in the same volume with the theoretical statements of contemporary writers was made after the General Statement (Chapter I) was completed and the committee had held its last meeting. The proposal was discussed, however, with four members of the Committee and concurred in by them.

The task of selecting paragraphs which are thoroughly representative has been greatly complicated by the necessity for brevity. The work has been done with care, and it is believed that the following paragraphs, though brief, do present a fair statement of the *curriculum* theories of Professor Dewey, and of the Herbartians, as they developed in the period following 1894. No attempt has been made to set forth other aspects of the educational philosophies of the writers in question.

H. R.

SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The assembling of the quotations in the following chapter has been made possible through the generous permission to quote from copyrighted publications accorded this Society by the holders of these copyrights.

In particular, the Society begs to make the following acknowledgments:

The excerpts from Dewey's *Interest and Effort in Education* (Riverside Educational Monograph Series) are reprinted by permission of the author and of the publishers, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass.

The excerpts from Dewey's *School and Society* and Dewey's *The Child and the Curriculum* are reprinted by permission of the author and of the publishers, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

The excerpts from Dewey's article entitled "Individuality and Experience," published in the *Journal of the Barnes Foundation,* Volume II, January, 1926, are reprinted with the permission of the Barnes Foundation.—*Editor.*

CHAPTER XII

REPRESENTATIVE QUOTATIONS FROM JOHN DEWEY'S WRITTEN STATEMENTS ON THE CURRICULUM (1900-1926)

I

"THE FUNDAMENTAL FACTORS IN THE EDUCATIVE PROCESS" (1902)

(From *The Child and the Curriculum*, pp. 7-8, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1902.)

The fundamental factors in the educative process are an immature, undeveloped being; and certain social aims, meanings, values incarnate in the matured experience of the adult. The educative process is the due interaction of these forces. Such a conception of each in relation to the other as facilitates completest and freest interaction is the essence of educational theory.

But here comes the effort of thought. It is easier to see the conditions in their separateness, to insist upon one at the expense of the other, to make antagonists of them, than to discover a reality to which each belongs. The easy thing is to seize upon something in the nature of the child, or upon something in the developed consciousness of the adult, and insist upon *that* as the key to the whole problem. When this happens a really serious practical problem—that of interaction—is transformed into an unreal, and hence insoluble, theoretic problem. Instead of seeing the educative steadily and as a whole, we see conflicting terms. We get the case of the child vs. curriculum; of the individual nature vs. social culture. Below all other divisions in pedagogic opinion lies this opposition.

II

ON THE NATURAL AND ACTIVE MODE OF LEARNING (1900)

(From *The School and Society*, pp. 35-38. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1900.)

Now the change which is coming into our education is the shifting of the center of gravity. It is a change, a revolution, not unlike that introduced by Copernicus when the astronomical center shifted from the earth to the sun. In this case the child becomes the sun

about which the appliances of education revolve; he is the center about which they are organized.

If we take an example from the ideal home, where the parent is intelligent enough to recognize what is best for the child, and is able to supply what is needed, we find the child learning through the social converse and constitution of the family. There are certain points of interest and value to him in the conversation carried on: statements are made, inquiries arise, topics are discussed, and the child continually learns. He states his experiences, his misconceptions are corrected. Again the child participates in the household occupations, and thereby gets habits of industry, order, and regard for the rights and ideas of others, and the fundamental habit of subordinating his activities to the general interest of the household. Participation in these household tasks becomes an opportunity for gaining knowledge. The ideal home would naturally have a workshop where the child could work out his constructive instincts. It would have a miniature laboratory in which his inquiries could be directed. The life of the child would extend out of doors to the garden, surrounding fields, and forests. He would have his excursions, his walks and talks, in which the larger world out of doors would open to him.

Now, if we organize and generalize all of this, we have the ideal school. There is no mystery about it, no wonderful discovery of pedagogy or educational theory. It is simply a question of doing systematically and in a large, intelligent, and competent way what for various reasons can be done in most households only in a comparatively meager and haphazard manner. In the first place, the ideal home has to be enlarged. The child must be brought into contact with more grown people and with more children in order that there may be the freest and richest social life. Moreover, the occupations and relationships of the home environment are not specially selected for the growth of the child; the main object is something else, and what the child can get out of them is incidental. Hence the need of a school. In this school the life of the child becomes the all-controlling aim. All the media necessary to further the growth of the child center here. Learning? certainly, but living primarily, and learning through and in relation to this living. When we take the life of the child centered and organized in this

way, we do not find that he is first of all a listening being; quite the contrary.

The statement so frequently made that education means "drawing out" is excellent, if we mean simply to contrast it with the process of pouring in. But, after all, it is difficult to connect the idea of drawing out with the ordinary doings of the child of three, four, seven, or eight years of age. He is already running over, spilling over, with activities of all kinds. He is not a purely latent being whom the adult has to approach with great caution and skill in order gradually to draw out some hidden germ of activity. The child is already intensely active, and the question of education is the question of taking hold of his activities, of giving them direction. Through direction, through organized use, they tend toward valuable results, instead of scattering or being left to merely impulsive expression.

III

On the Primary Impulses of Children (1900)

(From *The School and Society*, pp. 42-45. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

If we roughly classify the impulses which are available in the school, we may group them under four heads. There is the social instinct of the children as shown in conversation, personal intercourse and communication. We all know how self-centered the little child is at the age of four or five. If any new subject is brought up, if he says anything at all, it is: "I have seen that;" or, "My papa or mamma told me about that." His horizon is not large; an experience must come immediately home to him, if he is to be sufficiently interested to relate it to others and seek theirs in return. And yet the egoistic and limited interest of little children is in this manner capable of infinite expansion. The language instinct is the simplest form of the social expression of the child. Hence it is a great, perhaps the greatest of all educational resources.

Then there is the instinct of making—the constructive impulse. The child's impulse to do finds expression first in play, in movement, gesture, and make-believe, becomes more definite, and seeks outlet in shaping materials into tangible forms and permanent embodiment. The child has not much instinct for abstract inquiry. The instinct of investigation seems to grow out of the combination

of the constructive impulse with the conversational. There is no distinction between experimental science for little children and the work done in the carpenter shop. Such work as they can do in physics or chemistry is not for the purpose of making technical generalizations or even arriving at abstract truths. Children simply like to do things and watch to see what will happen. But this can be taken advantage of, can be directed into ways where it gives results of value, as well as be allowed to go on at random.

And so the expressive impulse of the children, the art instinct, grows also out of the communicating and constructive instincts. It is their refinement and full manifestation. Make the construction adequate, make it full, free, and flexible, give it a social motive, something to tell, and you have a work of art. Take one illustration of this in connection with the textile work—sewing and weaving. The children made a primitive loom in the shop; here the constructive instinct was appealed to. Then they wished to do something with this loom, to make something. It was the type of the Indian loom, and they were shown blankets woven by the Indians. Each child made a design kindred in idea to those of the Navajo blankets, and the one which seemed best adapted to the work in hand was selected. The technical resources were limited, but the coloring and form were worked out by the children. The example shown was made by the twelve-year-old children. Examination shows that it took patience, thoroughness, and perseverance to do the work. It involved not merely discipline and information of both a historical sort and the elements of technical design, but also something of the spirit of art in adequately conveying an idea.

One more instance of the connection of the art side with the constructive side: The children had been studying primitive spinning and carding, when one of them, twelve years of age, made a picture of one of the older children spinning. Here is another piece of work which is not quite average; it is better than the average. It is an illustration of two hands and the drawing out of the wool to get it ready for spinning. This was done by a child eleven years of age. But, upon the whole, with the younger children especially, the art impulse is connected mainly with the social instinct—the desire to tell, to represent.

Now, keeping in mind these fourfold interests—the interest in conversation, or communication; in inquiry, or finding out things;

in making things, or construction; and in artistic expression—we may say they are the natural resources, the uninvested capital, upon the exercise of which depends the active growth of the child.

IV

On the Formality of "Traditional Education" (1900)

(From *The School and Society,* pp. 32-33. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

Some few years ago I was looking about the school supply stores in the city, trying to find desks and chairs which seemed thoroughly suitable from all points of view—artistic, hygienic, and educational —to the needs of the children. We had a great deal of difficulty in finding what we needed, and finally one dealer, more intelligent than the rest, made this remark: "I am afraid we have not what you want. You want something at which the children may work; these are all for listening." That tells the story of the traditional education.

It is all made "for listening"—because simply studying lessons out of a book is only another kind of listening; it marks the dependency of one mind upon another. The attitude of listening means, comparatively speaking, passivity, absorption; that there are certain ready-made materials which are there, which have been prepared by the school superintendent, the board, the teacher, and of which the child is to take in as much as possible in the least possible time.

A lady told me yesterday that she had been visiting different schools trying to find one where activity on the part of the children preceded the giving of information on the part of the teacher, or where the children had some motive for demanding the information. She visited, she said, twenty-four different schools before she found her first instance. I may add that that was not in this city.

V

The Logically Organized Curriculum *vs.* the Child-Growth Curriculum (1902)

(From *The Child and the Curriculum,* pp. 12-14. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

Subdivide each topic into studies; each study into lessons; each lesson into specific facts and formulae. Let the child proceed step by step to master each one of these separate parts, and at last he will

have covered the entire ground. The road which looks so long when viewed in its entirety, is easily traveled, considered as a series of particular steps. Thus emphasis is put upon the logical subdivisions and consecutions of the subject matter. Problems of instruction are problems of procuring texts giving logical parts and sequences, and of presenting these portions in class in a similar definite and graded way. Subject matter furnishes the end, and it determines method. The child is simply the immature being who is to be matured; he is the superficial being who is to be deepened; his is narrow experience which is to be widened. It is his to receive, to accept. His part is fulfilled when he is ductile and docile.

Not so, says the other sect. The child is the starting-point, the center, and the end. His development, his growth, is the ideal. It alone furnishes the standard. To the growth of the child all studies are subservient; they are instruments valued as they serve the needs of growth. Personality, character, is more than subject matter. Not knowledge or information, but self-realization, is the goal. To possess all the world of knowledge and lose one's own self is as awful a fate in education as in religion. Moreover, subject matter never can be got into the child from without. Learning is active. It involves reaching out of the mind. It involves organic assimilation starting from within. Literally, we must take our stand with the child and our departure from him. It is he and not the subject matter which determines both quality and quantity of learning.

The only significant method is the method of the mind as it reaches out and assimilates. Subject matter is but spiritual food, possible nutritive material. It cannot digest itself; it cannot of its own accord turn into bone and muscle and blood. The source of whatever is dead, mechanical, and formal in schools is found precisely in the subordination of the life and experience of the child to the curriculum. It is because of this that "study" has become a synonym for what is irksome, and a "lesson" identical with a task.

VI

On the Significant Rôle of Adult Experience in Interpreting and Guiding Child Growth (1902)

(From *The Child and the Curriculum*, pp. 17-18. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

The problem of the relation of the child and the curriculum presents itself in this guise: Of what use, educationally speaking, is

it to be able to see the end in the beginning? How does it assist us in dealing with the early stages of growth to be able to anticipate its later phases? The studies, as we have agreed, represent the possibilities of development inherent in the child's immediate crude experience. But, after all, they are not parts of that present and immediate life. Why, then, or how, make account of them?

Asking such a question suggests its own answer. To see the outcome is to know in what direction the present experience is moving, provided it move normally and soundly. The far-away point, which is of no significance to us simply as far away, becomes of huge importance the moment we take it as defining a present direction of movement. Taken in this way it is no remote and distant result to be achieved, but a guiding method in dealing with the present. The systematized and defined experience of the adult mind, in other words, is of value to us in interpreting the child's life as it immediately shows itself, and in passing on to guidance or direction.

Let us look for a moment at these two ideas: interpretation and guidance. The child's present experience is in no way self-explanatory. It is not final, but transitional. It is nothing complete in itself, but just a sign or index of certain growth-tendencies. As long as we confine our gaze to what the child here and now puts forth, we are confused and misled.

VII

On the Need for the Teacher's Guidance of Learning (1902)

(From *The Child and the Curriculum*, pp. 22-25. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

There are those who see no alternative between forcing the child from without, or leaving him entirely alone. Seeing no alternative, some choose one mode, some another. Both fall into the same fundamental error. Both fail to see that development is a definite process, having its own law which can be fulfilled only when adequate and normal conditions are provided. Really to interpret the child's present crude impulses in counting, measuring, and arranging things in rhythmic series, involves mathematical scholarship—a knowledge of the mathematical formulae and relations

which have, in the history of the race, grown out of just such crude beginnings. To see the whole history of development which intervenes between these two terms is simply to see what step the child needs to take just here and now; to what use he needs to put his blind impulse in order that it may get clarity and gain force.

If, once more, the "old education" tended to ignore the dynamic quality, the developing force inherent in the child's present experience, and therefore to assume that direction and control were just matters of arbitrarily putting the child in a given path and compelling him to walk there, the "new education" is in danger of taking the idea of development in altogether too formal and empty a way. The child is expected to "develop" this or that fact or truth out of his own mind. He is told to think things out, or work things out for himself, without being supplied any of the environing conditions which are requisite to start and guide thought. Nothing can be developed from nothing; nothing but the crude can be developed out of the crude—and this is what surely happens when we throw the child back upon his achieved self as a finality, and invite him to spin new truths of nature or of conduct out of that. It is certainly as futile to expect a child to evolve a universe out of his own mere mind as it is for a philosopher to attempt that task. Development does not mean just getting something out of the mind. It is a development of experience that is really wanted. And this is impossible save as just that educative medium is provided which will enable the powers and interests that have been selected as valuable to function. They must operate, and how they operate will depend almost entirely upon the stimuli which surround them, and the material upon which they exercise themselves. The problem of direction is thus the problem of selecting appropriate stimuli for instinct and impulses which it is desired to employ in the gaining of new experience. What new experiences are desirable, and thus what stimuli are needed, it is impossible to tell except as there is some comprehension of the development which is aimed at; except, in a word, as the adult knowledge is drawn upon as revealing the possible career open to the child.

VIII

The Danger in Both Extremes—the "Old" and the "New" Educational Orders (1902)

(From *The Child and the Curriculum*, p. 20. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

Just as, upon the whole, it was the weakness of the "old education" that it made invidious comparisons between the immaturity of the child and the maturity of the adult, regarding the former as something to be got away from as soon as possible and as much as possible; so it is the danger of the "new education" that it regard the child's present powers and interests as something finally significant in themselves. In truth, his learnings and achievements are fluid and moving. They change from day to day and from hour to hour.

IX

Dewey's Recent Statement on the Rôle of the Teacher and the Necessity That the Course of Instruction Be Carefully Planned (1926)

(From "Individuality and experience," *Journal of the Barnes Foundation*, Vol. II, No. 1, January, 1926.)

[Dewey suggests that] the proponents of freedom are in a false position as well as the would-be masters and dictators. There is a present tendency in so-called advanced schools of educational thought (by no means confined to art classes like those of Cizek) to say, in effect, let us surround pupils with certain materials, tools, appliances, etc., and then let pupils respond to these things according to their own desires. Above all let us not suggest any end or plan to the students; let us not suggest to them what they shall do, for that is an unwarranted trespass upon their sacred intellectual individuality since the essence of such individuality is to set up ends and aims.

Now such a method is really stupid. For it attempts the impossible, which is always stupid; and it misconceives the conditions of independent thinking. There are a multitude of ways of reacting to surrounding conditions, and without some guidance from experience these reactions are almost sure to be casual, sporadic and ultimately fatiguing, accompanied by nervous strain. Since the teacher

has presumably a greater background of experience, there is the same presumption of the right of a teacher to make suggestions as to what to do, as there is on the part of the head carpenter to suggest to apprentices something of what they are to do. Moreover, the theory literally carried out would be obliged to banish all artificial materials, tools and appliances. Being the product of the skill, thought and matured experience of others, they would also, by the theory, "interfere" with personal freedom.

Moreover, when the child proposes or suggests what to do, some consequence to be attained, whence is the suggestion supposed to spring from? There is no spontaneous germination in the mental life. If he does not get the suggestion from the teacher, he gets it from somebody or something in the home or the street or from what some more vigorous fellow pupil is doing. Hence the chances are great of its being a passing and superficial suggestion, without much depth and range—in other words, not specially conducive to the developing of freedom. If the teacher is really a teacher, and not just a master or "authority," he should know enough about his pupils, their needs, experiences, degrees of skill and knowledge, etc., to be able (not to dictate aims and plans) to share in a discussion regarding what is to be done and be as free to make suggestions as any one else. (The implication that the teacher is the one and only person who has no "individuality" or "freedom" to "express" would be funny if it were not often so sad in its outworkings.) And his contribution, given the conditions stated, will presumably do more to getting something started which will really secure and increase the development of strictly individual capacities than will suggestions springing from uncontrolled haphazard sources.

The point is also worth dwelling upon, that the method of leaving the response entirely to pupils, the teacher supplying, in the language of the day, only the "stimuli," misconceives the nature of thinking. Any so-called "end" or "aim" or "project" which the average immature person can suggest in advance is likely to be highly vague and unformed, a mere outline sketch, not a suggestion of a definite result or consequence but rather a gesture which roughly indicates a field within which activities might be carried on. It hardly represents thought at all: it is a suggestion. The real intellectual shaping of the "end" or purpose comes during and

because of the operations subsequently performed. This is as true of the suggestion which proceeds from the teacher as of those which "spontaneously" spring from the pupils, so that the former does not restrict thought. The advantage of the side of the teacher—if he or she has any business to be in that position—is the greater probability that it will be a suggestion which will permit and require thought in the subsequent activity which builds up a clear and organized conception of an end. There is no more fatal flaw in psychology than that which takes the original vague fore-feeling of some consequence to be realized as the equivalent of a *thought* of an end, a true purpose and directive plan. The thought of an end is strictly correlative to perception of means and methods. Only when, and as the latter becomes clear during the serial process of execution does the project and guiding aim and plan become evident and articulated. In the full sense of the word, a person becomes aware of what he wants to do and what he is about only when the work is actually complete.

It goes without saying that a teacher may interfere and impose alien standards and methods during the operation. But as we have previously seen, this is not because of bringing to bear the results of previous experience, but because the habits of the teacher are so narrow and fixed, his imagination and sympathies so limited, his own intellectual horizon so bounded, that he brings them to bear in a wrong way. The fuller and richer the experience of the teacher, the more adequate his own knowledge of "traditions" the more likely is he, given the attitude of participator instead of that of master, to use them in a liberating way.

Freedom or individuality, in short, is not an original possession or gift. It is something to be achieved, to be wrought out. Suggestions as to things which may advantageously be taken, as to skill, as to methods of operation, are indispensable conditions of its achievement. These by the nature of the case must come from a sympathetic and discriminating knowledge of what has been done in the past and how it has been done.

X

On the Rôle of Studies and Subject Matter (1902)

(From *The Child and the Curriculum*, pp. 27-29. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

That which we call a science or study puts the net product of past experience in the form which makes it most available for the future. It represents a capitalization which may at once be turned to interest. It economizes the workings of the mind in every way. Memory is less taxed because the facts are grouped together about some common principle, instead of being connected solely with the varying incidents of their original discovery. Observation is assisted; we know what to look for. It is the difference between looking for a needle in a haystack, and searching for a given paper in a well-arranged cabinet. Reasoning is directed, because there is a certain general path or line laid out along which ideas naturally march instead of moving from one chance association to another.

There is, then, nothing final about a logical rendering of experience. Its value is not contained in itself; its significance is that of standpoint, outlook, method. It intervenes between the more casual, tentative, and round-about experiences of the past, and more controlled and orderly experiences of the future. It gives past experience in that net form which renders it most available and most significant, most fecund for future experience. The abstractions, generalizations, and classifications which it introduces all have prospective meaning.

The formulated result is then not to be opposed to the process of growth. The logical is not set over against the psychological. The surveyed and arranged result occupies a critical position in the process of growth. It marks a turning-point. It shows how we may get the benefit of past effort in controlling future endeavor. In the largest sense the logical standpoint is itself psychological; it has its meaning as a point in the development of experience, and its justification is in its functioning in the future growth which it insures.

Hence the need of reinstating into experience the subject matter of the studies, or branches of learning. It must be restored to the experience from which it has been abstracted. It needs to be *psychologized;* turned over, translated into the immediate and individual experiencing within which it has its origin and significance.

XI

On the Teacher's Rôle in Psychologizing Subject Matter (1902)

(From *The Child and the Curriculum*, p. 30. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

[The teacher] is not concerned with adding new facts to the science he teaches; in propounding new hypotheses or in verifying them. He is concerned with the subject matter of the science as *representing a given stage and phase of the development of experience.* His problem is that of inducing a vital and personal experiencing. Hence, what concerns him, as teacher, is the ways in which that subject may become a part of experience; what there is in the child's present that is usable with reference to it; how such elements are to be used; how his own knowledge of the subject matter may assist in interpreting the child's needs and doings, and determine the medium in which the child should be placed in order that his growth may be properly directed. He is concerned, not with the subject matter as such, but with the subject matter as a related factor in a total and growing experience. Thus to see it is to psychologize it.

It is the failure to keep in mind the double aspect of subject matter which causes the curriculum and child to be set over against each other. . . .

XII

On the Class Exercise as a Forum for the Interchange of Ideas (1900)

(From *The School and Society*, pp. 48-50. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

I should like at this point to refer to the recitation. We all know what it has been—a place where the child shows off to the teacher and the other children the amount of information he has succeeded in assimilating from the textbook. From this other standpoint the recitation becomes pre-eminently a social meeting-place; it is to the school what the spontaneous conversation is at home, excepting that it is more organized, following definite lines. The recitation becomes the social clearing-house, where experiences and ideas are exchanged and subjected to criticism, where misconceptions are corrected, and new lines of thought and inquiry are set up.

This change of the recitation, from an examination of knowledge already acquired to the free play of the children's communicative instinct, affects and modifies all the language work of the school. Under the old regime it was unquestionably a most serious problem to give the children a full and free use of language. The reason was obvious. The natural motive for language was seldom offered. In the pedagogical textbooks language is defined as the medium of expressing thought. It becomes that, more or less, to adults with trained minds, but it hardly needs to be said that language is primarily a social thing, a means by which we give our experiences to others and get theirs again in return. When it is taken away from its natural purpose, it is no wonder that it becomes a complex and difficult problem to teach language.

When the language instinct is appealed to in a social way, there is a continual contact with reality. The result is that the child always has something in his mind to talk about, he has something to say; he has a thought to express, and a thought is not a thought unless it is one's own. On the traditional method, the child must say something that he has merely learned. There is all the difference in the world between having something to say and having to say something. The child who has a variety of materials and facts wants to talk about them, and his language becomes more refined and full, because it is controlled and informed by realities. Reading and writing, as well as the oral use of language, may be taught on this basis. It can be done in a *related* way, as the outgrowth of the child's social desire to recount his experiences and get in return the experiences of others, directed always through contact with the facts and forces which determine the truth communicated.

XIII

On the Contrast in Reality of Old and New Forms of Practical Education: Pioneer *vs.* Modern Life (1900)

(From *The School and Society*, pp. 7-9. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

We cannot overlook the factors of discipline and of character-building involved in this kind of life: training in habits of order and of industry, and in the idea of responsibility, of obligation to do something, to produce something, in the world. There was always

something which really needed to be done, and a real necessity that each member of the household should do his own part faithfully and in coöperation with others. Personalities which became effective in action were bred and tested in the medium of action. Again, we cannot overlook the importance for educational purposes of the close and intimate acquaintance got with nature at first hand, with real things and materials, with the actual processes of their manipulation, and the knowledge of their social necessities and uses. In all this there was continual training of observation, of ingenuity, constructive imagination, of logical thought, and of the sense of reality acquired through first-hand contact with actualities. The educative forces of the domestic spinning and weaving, of the sawmill, the gristmill, the cooper shop, and the blacksmith forge, were continuously operative.

No number of object-lessons, got up as object lessons for the sake of giving information, can afford even the shadow of a substitute for acquaintance with the plants and animals of the farm and garden acquired through actual living among them and caring for them. No training of sense-organs in school, introduced for the sake of training, can begin to compete with the alertness and fullness of sense-life that comes through daily intimacy and interest in familiar occupations. Verbal memory can be trained in committing tasks, a certain discipline of the reasoning powers can be acquired through lessons in science and mathematics; but, after all, this is somewhat remote and shadowy compared with the training of attention and of judgment that is acquired in having to do things with a real motive behind and a real outcome ahead. At present, concentration of industry and division of labor have practically eliminated household and neighborhood occupations—at least for educational purposes.

XIV

On Making the School an "Embryonic Community" (1900)

(From *The School and Society,* pp. 26-28. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

The obvious fact is that our social life has undergone a thorough and radical change. If our education is to have any meaning for life, it must pass through an equally complete transformation. This

transformation is not something to appear suddenly, to be executed in a day by conscious purpose. It is already in progress. Those modifications of our school system which often appear (even to those most actively concerned with them, to say nothing of their spectators) to be mere changes of detail, mere improvement within the school mechanism, are in reality signs and evidences of evolution. The introduction of active occupations, of nature study, of elementary science, of art, of history; the relegation of the merely symbolic and formal to a secondary position; the change in the moral school atmosphere, in the relation of pupils and teachers—of discipline; the introduction of more active, expressive, and self-directing factors—all these are not mere accidents, they are necessities of the larger social evolution. It remains but to organize all these factors, to appreciate them in their fulness of meaning, and to put the ideas and ideals involved into complete, uncompromising possession of our school system. To do this means to make each one of our schools an embryonic community life, active with types of occupations that reflect the life of the larger society and permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history, and science. When the school introduces and trains each child of society into membership within such a little community, saturating him with the spirit of service, and providing him with the instruments of effective self-direction, we shall have the deepest and best guaranty of a larger society which is worthy, lovely, and harmonious.

XV

On the Rôle of Manual Occupations in the School (1900)

(From *The School and Society*, pp. 15-16, 11, 17, 20. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

The great thing to keep in mind, then, regarding the introduction into the school of various forms of active occupation, is that through them the entire spirit of the school is renewed. It has a chance to affiliate itself with life, to become the child's habitat, where he learns through directed living, instead of being only a place to learn lessons having an abstract and remote reference to some possible living to be done in the future. It gets a chance to be a miniature community, an embryonic society. This is the fundamental fact, and from

this arise continuous and orderly streams of instruction. Under the industrial regime described [the pioneer regime], the child, after all, shared in the work, not for the sake of the sharing, but for the sake of the product. The educational results secured were real, yet incidental and dependent. But in the school the typical occupations followed are freed from all economic stress. The aim is not the economic value of the products, but the development of social power and insight. It is this liberation from narrow utilities, this openness to the possibilities of the human spirit, that makes these practical activities in the school allies of art and centers of science and history.

We must conceive of work in wood and metal, of weaving, sewing, and cooking, as methods of living and learning, not as distinct studies.

It is through occupations determined by this environment that mankind has made its historical and political progress. It is through these occupations that the intellectual and emotional interpretation of nature has been developed. It is through what we do in and with the world that we read its meaning and measure its value.

In educational terms, this means that these occupations in the school shall not be mere practical devices or modes of routine employment, the gaining of better technical skill as cooks, seamstresses, or carpenters, but active centers of scientific insight into natural materials and processes, points of departure whence children shall be led out into a realization of the historic development of man.

The occupation supplies the child with a genuine motive; it gives him experience at first hand; it brings him into contact with realities. It does all this, but in addition it is liberalized throughout by translation into its historic and social values and scientific equivalencies. With the growth of the child's mind in power and knowledge it ceases to be a pleasant occupation merely and becomes more and more a medium, an instrument, an organ of understanding —and is thereby transformed.

XVI

INTEREST *vs.* EFFORT: THE RESPECTIVE ARGUMENTS (1913)

(From *Interest and Effort in Education*, pp. 1-2 and 3-5. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1913.)

In the educational lawsuit of interest *versus* effort, let us consider the respective briefs of plaintiff and defendant. In behalf of interest it is claimed that it is the sole guarantee of attention; if we can secure interest in a given set of facts or ideas, we may be perfectly sure that the pupil will direct his energies toward mastering them; if we can secure interest in a certain moral train or line of conduct, we are equally safe in assuming that the child's activities are responding in that direction; if we have not secured interest, we have no safeguard as to what will be done in any given case. As a matter of fact, the doctrine of discipline has not succeeded. It is absurd to suppose that a child gets more intellectual or mental discipline when he goes at a matter unwillingly than when he goes at it out of the fullness of his heart. The theory of effort simply says that unwilling attention (doing something disagreeable because it is disagreeable) should take precedence over spontaneous attention.

We may now hear the defendant's case. Life, says the other theory, is full of things not interesting that have to be faced. Demands are continually made, situations have to be dealt with, which present no features of interest. Unless one has had previous training in devoting himself to uninteresting work, unless habits have been formed of attending to matters simply because they must be attended to irrespective of the personal satisfaction they afford, character will break down or avoid the issue when confronted with the serious matters of life. Life is not a merely pleasant affair, or a continual satisfaction of personal interests. There must be such continual exercise of effort in the performance of tasks as to form the habit of dealing with the real labors of life. Anything else eats out the fiber of character and leaves a wishy-washy, colorless being; a state of moral dependence, with continual demand for amusement and distraction.

Apart from the question of the future, continually to appeal even in childhood days to the principle of interest is eternally to excite, that is, distract the child. Continuity of activity is destroyed.

Everything is made play, amusement. This means over-stimulation; it means dissipation of energy. Will is never called into action. The reliance is upon external attractions and amusements. Everything is sugar-coated for the child, and he soon learns to turn from everything that is not artificially surrounded with diverting circumstances. The spoiled child who does only what he likes is an inevitable outcome.

XVII

DEWEY'S OWN POSITION ON INTEREST *vs.* EFFORT (1913)

(From *Interest and Effort in Education*, p. 7. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1913.)

I have attempted to set forth the respective claims of each side of the discussion. A little reflection will convince us that the strong point in each argument lies not so much in what it says in its own behalf as in its attacks on the weak places of the opposite theory. Each theory is strong in its negations rather than in its position. It is not unusual, though somewhat surprising, that there is generally a common principle unconsciously assumed at the basis of two theories which to all outward appearances are the extreme opposites of each other. Such a common principle is found in the theories of effort and interest in the one-sided forms in which they have already been stated.

The common assumption is that of the externality of the object, idea, or end to be mastered to the self. Because the object or end is assumed to be outside self it has to be *made* interesting; to be surrounded with artificial stimuli and with fictitious inducements to attention. Or, because the object lies outside the sphere of self, the sheer power of "will," the putting forth of effort without interest, has to be appealed to. The genuine principle of interest is the principle of the recognized identity of the fact to be learned or the action proposed with the growing self; that it lies in the direction of the agent's own growth, and is, therefore, imperiously demanded, if the agent is to be himself. Let this condition of identification once be secured, and we have neither to appeal to sheer strength of will, nor to occupy ourselves with making things interesting.

XVIII

On "Making" Things Interesting (1913)

(From *Interest and Effort in Education*, pp. 11-13 and 33-34. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1913.)

The principle of "making" objects and ideas interesting implies the same divorce between object and self. When things have to be *made* interesting, it is because interest itself is wanting. Moreover, the phrase is a misnomer. The thing, the object, is no more interesting than it was before. The appeal is simply made to the child's love of something else. He is excited in a given direction, with the hope that somehow or other during this excitation he will assimilate something otherwise repulsive.

The purely adventitious interests we have discussed—making a thing interesting by the sugar-coating method—assumes a certain ready subject matter—a subject matter existing wholly independently of the pupil's own activity. It then asks how this alien subject matter may be introduced into the pupil's mind; how his attention may be drawn away from the things with which it is naturally concerned and drawn to this indifferent, ready-made external material. Some interest, some bond of connection, must be found. Prevalent practices and the training and disposition of the teacher will decide whether the methods of "hard" or of "soft" pedagogy shall be resorted to; whether we shall have a "soup-kitchen" type of teaching or a "penitentiary" type. Shall the indifferent thing (indifferent because lying outside of the individual's scheme of activities) be made interesting—by clothing it with adventitious traits that are agreeable; or by methods of threats—by making attention to it less disagreeable than the consequences of non-attention so that study is a choice of the lesser of two evils?

Both of these methods, however, represent failure to ask the right question and to seek for the right method of solution. What course of activity exists already (by native endowment or by past achievement) operative in the pupil's experience *with respect to which the thing to be learned, the mode of skill to be acquired, is either a means or an end?* What line of action is there, that is to say, which can be carried forward to its appropriate termination better by noting and using the subject matter? Or what line of action is there, which can be directed so that when carried to its

completion it will naturally terminate in the things to be learned? The mistake, once more, consists in overlooking the activities in which the child is already engaged, or in assuming that they are so trivial or so irrelevant that they have no significance for education. When they are duly taken into account the new subject matter is interesting on its own account in the degree in which it enters into their operation.

XIX

On "The Gist of the Psychology of Interest" (1913)

(From *Interest and Effort in Education,* pp. 20-21. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1913.)

The gist of the psychology of interest may, accordingly, be stated as follows: An interest is primarily a form of self-expressive activity—that is, of growth that comes through acting upon nascent tendencies. If we examine this activity on the side of what is done, we get its objective features, the ideas, objects, etc., to which the interest is attached, about which it clusters. If we take into account that it is *self*-development, that self finds itself in this content, we get its emotional or appreciative side. Any account of genuine interest must, therefore, grasp it as out-going activity holding within its grasp an object of direct value.

XX

On the Significant Rôle of Effort in Education (1913)

(From *Interest and Effort in Education,* pp. 43, 46, 46-47, 49-51, 55-56, 58-59. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1913.)

The next step in the discussion consists in seeing that effort comes into play in the degree in which achievement of an activity is postponed or remote; and that the significance of situations demanding effort is their connection with thought.

What is it that we really prize under the name of effort? What is it that we are really trying to secure when we regard increase in ability to put forth effort as an aim of education? Taken practically, there is no great difficulty in answering. What we are after is *persistency, consecutiveness,* of activity: endurance against obstacles and through hindrances. Effort regarded as mere increase of

strain in the expenditure of energy is not in itself a thing we esteem.

On the other hand, a judicious parent will not like to see a child too easily discouraged by meeting obstacles. If the child is physically healthy, surrender of a course of action, or diversion of energy to some easier line of action, is a bad symptom if it shows itself at the first sign of resistance. The demand for effort is a demand for *continuity* in the face of difficulties.

Two considerations follow. (1) On the one hand, when an activity persists in spite of its temporary blocking by an obstacle, there is a situation of *mental* stress: a peculiar emotional condition of combined desire and aversion. The end continues to make an appeal, and to hold one to the activity in spite of its interruption by difficulties. This continued forward appeal gives desire. The obstacle, on the other hand, in the degree in which it arrests or thwarts progress ahead, inhibits action, and tends to divert it into some other channel—to avert action, in other words, from the original end. This gives aversion. Effort, as a mental experience, is precisely this *peculiar combination of conflicting tendencies*—tendencies away from and tendencies towards: dislike and longing.

(2) The other consideration is even more important, for it decides what happens. The emotion of effort, or of stress, is a warning to *think,* to consider, to reflect, to inquire, to look into the matter. Is the end worth while under the circumstances? Is there not some other course which, under the circumstances, is better? So far as this reconsideration takes place, the situation is quite different from that of a person merely giving up as soon as an obstacle shows itself. Even if the final decision is to give up, the case is radically different from the case of giving up from mere instability of purpose. The giving up now involves an appeal to reason, and may be quite consistent with tenacity of purpose or "strength of will." However, reflection may take quite another course: it may lead not to reconsideration of ends, but to seeking for *new* means; in short, to discovery and invention also. The child who cannot carry the stone that he wishes may neither keep on in a fruitless struggle to achieve the impossible, nor yet surrender his purpose; he may be led to think of some other way of getting the stone into motion;

he may try prying it along with a bar. "Necessity is the mother of invention."

In the latter case, the obstacle has, indeed, diverted energy; but the significant thing is that energy is *diverted into thinking;* into an intelligent consideration of the situation and of available ways and means. The really important matter in the experience of effort concerns its connection with thought. The question is not the amount of sheer strain involved, but the way in which the *thought of an end* persists in spite of difficulties, and induces a person to reflect upon the nature of the obstacles and the available resources by which they may be dealt with.

The question to be borne in mind is, then, two-fold: Is this person doing something too easy for him—something which has not a sufficient element of resistance to arouse his energies, especially his energies of thinking? Or is the work assigned so difficult that he has not the resources required in order to cope with it—so alien to his experience and his acquired habits that he does not know where or how to take hold? Between these two questions lies the teacher's task—for the teacher has a problem as well as the pupil. How shall the activities of pupils be progressively complicated by the introduction of difficulties, and yet these difficulties be of a nature to stimulate instead of dulling and merely discouraging? The judgment, the tact, the intellectual sympathy of instructors is taxed to the uttermost in answering these questions in the concrete with respect to the various subjects of study.

Good teaching, in other words, is teaching that appeals to established powers while it includes such *new* materials as will demand their redirection for a new end, this redirection requiring thought —intelligent effort. In every case, the educational significance of effort, its value for an educative growth, resides in its connection with a stimulation of greater *thoughtfulness,* not in the greater strain it imposes. Educative effort is a sign of the transformation of a comparatively blind activity (whether impulsive or habitual) into a more consciously reflective one.

For the sake of completeness of statement we will say (what hardly should now require statement on its own account) that such effort is in no sense a foe of interest. It is a part of the process of growth of activity from direct interest to indirect.

CHAPTER XIII

REPRESENTATIVE QUOTATIONS FROM THE WRITTEN STATEMENTS ON THE CURRICULUM BY THE HERBARTIANS AND THEIR CRITICS (1894-1896)

CHARLES DEGARMO
CHARLES A. MCMURRY
FRANK M. MCMURRY
C. C. VAN LIEW
JOHN DEWEY
FRANCIS W. PARKER

I

DEGARMO ON THE CURRENT DISCUSSION OF: WHAT SHALL THE SCHOOLS TEACH? (1895)

(From *The First Yearbook of the Herbart Society for Scientific Study of Teaching*, 1895, pp. 4 and 5.)

One of the problems that has already forced itself upon us, is, therefore: What shall the public school teach? That this problem is already being vigorously attacked, witness the efforts of New England to shorten and enrich the grammar-school curriculum, the report of the Committee of Ten, and the report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education, presented last February before the Department of Superintendence at Cleveland.

Many and various are the schemes for solving the problem. Some would rigorously exclude all the new and cling desperately to the old. Others would discard the old and cling to the new. This is what Prof. Stoy used to call "surgical pedagogy." To reduce weight it amputates limbs. Some advocate the application of the elective system of the university to the elementary and secondary schools. If there is a such a wealth of good material, why not let the child choose what he fancies? To such a course, many serious objections might be urged. The idea of election in lower schools is apparently based on the doctrine that study of any kind has a disciplinary value for the mind, without much regard to its content. The old idea was that grammar and mathematics are the indispensable disciplines in school training. The new insight appears to be that geography and history, or other studies, will serve the purpose equally well. The validity of this theory is discussed in a very able article by Prof. Hinsdale, of the University of Michigan,

in a recent number of the *Educational Review*. That article, perhaps, better than anything else of recent origin, brings us down to date on the question of the worth and worthlessness of the idea of formal discipline of the mind by any restricted group of studies.

Some try to meet the new difficulty concerning the curriculum by taking into the course of study all good things; but such efforts defeat themselves so quickly that they may be dismissed at once.

Col. Parker's most recent and most notable book seeks a solution by basing all concrete study on the central sciences of mineralogy, geology, geography, astronomy, meterology, biology, zoölogy, anthropology, ethnology, and history, or, in other words, upon a hierarchy of sciences.

We have, on the other hand, equally earnest attempts to subordinate science studies to the humanities. The monumental work of the late Professor Ziller, of Leipsic, a disciple of Herbart, must ever stand as the prototype for all efforts of this kind.

Finally, men are trying to solve the problem of the curriculum by a rational selection of typical studies in all important departments of learning to the end that a fairly balanced development of mind may be secured for all children and that each individual may find himself in touch with the forces that will determine his destiny, and to the end that he may wake at the beginning of active life to find himself an adherent of the dust-covered ideals of the past, and quite out of touch with his own most potent environment.

The appearance of the report of the Committee of Fifteen upon the correlation of studies and the debate upon it at Cleveland, have made it apparent that the term *correlation* must receive a wider interpretation than has been given to it hitherto by writers of the Herbartian school. Previous to the appearance of the report, current educational literature had assumed that to correlate studies is to make the pupil aware of interesting and valuable cross-relations existing between them. This form of correlation, to be established for psychological and other reasons, is meant to appeal directly to the consciousness of the pupil. It is designed to enhance his understanding and interest, to economize his effort, to enlarge his outlook upon life, and above all to produce a favorable effect upon his conduct, by deepening his insight, improving his disposition, and strengthening his will.

The report itself, however, has quite a different conception of correlation. Briefly stated, it defines correlation to mean the harmony of educational functions performed by the various studies in enabling the pupil to master his environment, and to become fitted for his work in life. Each study, therefore, must be questioned as to its peculiar office in fitting the child for civilization, so that the report in its main scope is nothing more than a critique of educational values, an estimate of the worth of each study in a system of education. The studies are conceived to work together for the accomplishment of a common end, the education of the child, just as the legislative, executive, and judiciary work together for their common end—government. Each presupposes and is reflected in the other, without which it would have small power to accomplish its ultimate purpose. Legislation without execution would amount to nothing; so mathematics alone would have small value in fitting the child to be a citizen, or as the Herbartian would say, it reveals to him his place and office in the moral order of the world. This form of correlation is wholly objective, since the pupil need never be conscious that such a correlation exists. The studies may be as distinct from one another in the schoolroom as a judge is from a legislator, or as the executive is from both. Heretofore such investigations have been classed under grounds for the *selection* of studies, but at present there is nothing to do but to enlarge our conception of correlation so as to cover two distinct fields, as follows:

I. Objective Correlation.
 1. The Educational Value of Studies.
 2. The Equivalence of Studies.

II. Subjective or Psychological Correlations.
 1. Concentration, Subordination of Secondary to Primary Studies.
 (1) Ziller.
 (2) Parker.
 2. Correlation Within Departments (Geography, History, Science, etc.).
 3. Correlation of Departments (Geography with History, etc.).

II

DeGarmo on the Educational Value of Studies—The Demands of Civilization *vs.* Mental Discipline as the Basis of Selection

(From the *First Yearbook of the Herbart Society for Scientific Study of Teaching*, 1895, p. 9.)

Taking up these problems in the order given we come first to the problem of educational values as a basis for the selection of studies. The report of the Committee of Fifteen upon this subject is a noteworthy document, since it abandons the dogma of formal culture or mental discipline that has hitherto reigned supreme in American education, and adopts in its stead substantially that demanded by the Herbartians, namely, the idea that the primary purpose of instruction in the branches of learning is the moral revelation of the world to the child. The old motto was "discipline *and* knowledge," the former at all hazards, the latter if there is time for it; the new motto is "discipline *through* knowledge." The report substitutes the demands of civilization for the former psychological demand of mental discipline as a guide to the estimates of educational values.

III

DeGarmo on Ziller's and Parker's Plans of Concentration

(From the *First Yearbook of the Herbart Society for Scientific Study of Teaching*, 1895, pp. 16-19.)

Ziller's scheme of concentration is briefly as follows: 1. The culture studies, biblical and profane history, and literature shall be the center about which all other subjects shall be concentrated. 2. The central subjects shall develop according to the sequence demanded by the culture epochs. 3. The other, or secondary subjects, shall have no independent principle of sequence for themselves, but shall wait upon the associations that arise in connection with the central subjects for their place in the program. 4. The development of character is the primary purpose of the school and all the ideas of the child shall be connected and focused upon the good at all times. 5. The moral interest must therefore be perpetually stimulated.

If the primary object of education is to enable the child to master the elements of his civilization through the various studies,

it must be clear that one phase like History or Literature should not be allowed to dominate and subordinate others which, if different, are equally important. Why should natural science be dissolved in literature? Why are the civic lessons that may be drawn from History more powerful in affecting the will and destiny of the child than the economic lessons that may be drawn from Geography? Why should whole departments of learning remain in leading strings to Literature and History? Are these departments not of sufficient coördinate importance with the latter studies to be worthy of following their own principles of sequence and of having their elements correlated with one another rather than with the elements of subjects foreign to them in nature and development?

Science has only fairly emerged from the shackles of literary treatment in the high school and college into independence and consequent value as an instrument in education. To begin the old subjection over again in the elementary school upon the plea of concentration would seem to cancel in principle the advance we have made in practice. While acknowledging the fruitfulness of many of Ziller's suggestions concerning concentration, it must still be urged that on the whole his work rests upon a distorted psychological view of the child and an inadequate conception of the functions of the studies in fitting the child for civilization. The subordination of other studies to Literature and History costs more than the resulting organization of studies amounts to.

With Ziller, as we have seen, the Primary studies are the culture subjects, history and literature, since these are presumed to be of the highest moral value, but with Col. Parker a different basis is adopted for the selection of the primary subjects. The latter's "Theory of Concentration" has for its chief problem the relation of expression to thought. The fundamental idea of the book appears to be that the studies that deal mostly with the forms of expression like reading, spelling, writing, grammar and arithmetic, should no longer hold their place as formalized and isolated studies, but should be brought into the closest relation to the various concrete thought studies of the curriculum. Furthermore, in contrast with Ziller's history and literature as the moral backbone of the course, the concrete thought studies recommended in Col. Parker's "Theory of Concentration" belong mostly to what we should designate nature

or science studies. The central subjects comprise mineralogy geology, geography, astronomy, meteorology, biology, zoölogy, anthropology, and history. There is to be the closest correlation possible among these subjects, the logical, or philosophical relations existing among them being the guide to their unification. This effort reduces the whole to a hierarchy of sciences, with philosophical unity existing between the various elements of the subject matter, and strict subordination of "form" to "content" studies. The problem is therefore a double one, coördination of knowledge subjects, and subordination of studies of expression to those of thought. It will be seen, therefore, that this volume attempts the solution of a number of important problems pertaining to the curriculum. The most obvious may be stated as follows:

1. The backbone of the course shall be nature, not culture studies.

2. The elements of the knowledge studies shall be closely correlated or coördinated.

3. The principles of sequence and association shall be the natural law binding all together—the law of energy working through matter. The principle of correlation is therefore not culture epochs (is it the epochs of natural evolution?) or even primarily the apperceptive needs of the child, but at bottom the principle of philosophical unity that binds all nature into one.

4. The principle of *concentration* comes in when a place is sought for what are usually called "form" studies, and which pertain mostly to language and nature. They are to be strictly subordinated to the content subjects, that is, to grow out of them and to be connected with them, as language grows out of and is connected with thought. They are not to be taught as separate disciplines, or independent studies, but shall be purely resultants of intrinsic thought.

IV

DeGarmo on Correlation Within Departments of Study and of Such Departments

(Including a quotation from Charles A. McMurry)

(From the *First Yearbook of the Herbart Society for Scientific Study of Teaching*, 1895, pp. 20-23.)

If the correlation of studies is to be based upon abiding and important relations existing among the elements of knowledge as

opposed to accidental and less important ones, then it follows that correlation *within* departments is antecedent to correlation of departments.

Geography has been taught as three or four isolated subjects, like political, mathematical, physical, and occasionally commercial, geography. These should be blended into a unit, for each presupposes and implies the other.

In the same way history has had little unification in the schools except through the barren category of chronology. Explanations of determining political, economical, and geographical causes that have made history what it is do not get into the textbooks; so that our children are taught a few isolated facts, which in their minds have no adequate ground of existence, and no consequences as new causes. Elementary science is so devoid of organization that most schools either never attempt it or fail to secure satisfactory results.

We must then seek for the most effective unifying principle for each department of study, which will naturally be the leading purpose why we pursue the study at all. Here the objective basis of correlation found in the function of studies will assuredly be our chief guide. Thus in geography, for example, the fundamental reason for the existence of the subject is not to be found in astronomical, or purely physical or political facts, but in a comprehension of how human industries, institutions, and commercial activities utilize these elements of difference for the happiness and well-being of the individual and the progress of civilization. That is, all geography finds its unifying idea in what may be called the economic conceptions.

But in seeking out the elements of a given department, which are to be correlated according to some leading idea, we come at once upon important cross-relations existing between different branches of study. An illustration is seen in the mutual relations existing between geography and history. In the study of geography, that of (political) history bears an insignificant part, but it is quite otherwise when we examine history. Here we are dealing with a process, not a product; so that physical and human elements of difference have, substantially, a determining effect upon the course of events. This brings us to a new problem:

Since each department has its own well-defined function in effecting the education of youth, it never loses its identity as an

integral part of the curriculum or surrenders its right to a sequence of parts determined by its own nature. Its correlation with its fellows is, therefore, a *coördination,* not a *subordination,* or concentration.

The extent to which a study should preserve its integrity as an independent branch is well presented by Dr. Charles A. McMurry in the *Educational Review* for May, 1895. He says: "But the practical teacher is certain to ask the question, 'How far shall we follow these relations of geography to natural science, history, etc.?' Just so far as they explain and clear up the central geographical topic with which we started out, without overloading it. We have no right in the midst of a geographical discussion to run across to some scientific topic, and in the treatment of it to lose sight of the original subject. If this were true, we should be equally justified in running on from the natural science topic into history and never returning to our original point of departure. But this would lead to total confusion of studies.

To treat well an important type-study in geography requires a teacher who never loses sight of the central object, who can see and trace out the relations of this main topic to other studies without losing his head. He must know the difference between the center and circumference of his subjects. He must maintain a sort of judicial balance, which enables him to keep his bearings, to skirmish along the outposts, and yet to keep the center intact. We have been accustomed heretofore to treat topics in any study in such an isolated way, not tracing relations into other studies, that the moment we begin to see and emphasize relations we are in danger of overdoing it.

V

Frank M. McMurry's Theses on Concentration

(From the *First Yearbook of the Herbart Society for Scientific Study of Teaching,* 1895, p. 27.)

The following are the chief theses . . .

I. It is an essential part of good instruction to relate ideas closely and abundantly with one another. The law of apperception demands it. The topic that deals with this matter is

properly called concentration, rather than correlation or coördination, of studies.

II. There are at least six weighty arguments in favor of concentration:

(1) It increases strength of character.
(2) It increase the apperceiving power of the mind.
(3) It increases interest in general, especially interest at the beginning of recitation and in review.
(4) It increases thoroughness of knowledge.
(5) It saves time and prevents the curriculum from being crowded.
(6) It strengthens memory.

III. Concentration aims at a psychological, rather than a philosophical unity of thought.

IV. The studies in the common-school curriculum are by nature closely related to one another.

V. In order that the child may appreciate this relationship, the studies must be carefully arranged with reference to one another. The history of teaching indicates that in making such an arrangement, a center must be chosen about which thoughts shall be associated.

VI. Neither the teacher nor the child can be this desired center: that duty must fall to one of the studies in the curriculum, to which the other studies shall be subordinated.

VII. The unity and individuality of the separate branches need not be destroyed by such subordination.

VIII. Since the development of good character is the primary object of the school, literature and history are the most important subjects of study; hence, they can best form the center for concentration.

IX. History as the central study for the upper grades is abundantly and closely related to other subjects; literature as a center for the lower grades is also probably sufficiently related to secure the proper kind of concentration.

VI

Summary of Herbartian Propositions on the Correlation of Studies (1895)

(From the *First Yearbook of the Herbart Society for Scientific Study of Teaching*, 1895, pp. 24-26.)

1. The highest function of the studies is an ethical revelation of the elements of civilization to the child.

2. Each department of study has a distinct ethical office in fitting the child for life, and should for this reason, if for no other, retain its integrity as a subject of study.

3. The term *correlation* is universal, and includes both *coördination* and *concentration*. Concentration subordinates secondary to primary subjects, while coördination associates related subjects, allowing each to retain its integrity as a distinct study, and permitting it to have its own principle of sequence of parts.

4. Objective correlation, as treated in the report of the Committee of Fifteen, discusses the relative educational value of studies, and involves a consideration of their equivalence. It is made by the philosopher in his study, and does not appeal to the consciousness of the child in the school. It merely determines the function of each study in enabling the child to master his environment, thus giving the reason for its presence in the curriculum; but it determines nothing as to time, amount, sequence of parts, or the relation to other branches that it should have in the recitation.

5. The demands of civilization should take precedence of formal mental discipline as a guide to the selection of studies.

6. The apperception of the child is the basis for those phases of correlation not covered by objective correlation. It determines the position of studies in the curriculum, the principle of sequence to be observed in their progress, and their internal and their external organization, *i.e.*, correlation *within* departments, and correlation *of* departments.

7. The sequence demanded by culture epochs must be recognized, but must be kept in subjection to the demands of the child's environment.

8. Ziller's scheme of concentration, which subordinates all other branches to history and literature, is to be rejected in principle, since his ideal of the ethical value of studies is too subjective, fail-

ing to recognize properly the function of the other studies in fitting for the social, political, and economic functions that the individual must perform in a complex civilization.

9. Col. Parker's plan of concentration gives us our best discussion of the relation of "form" to "thought studies," but is open to criticism in that it tends to emphasize nature at the expense of culture subjects, to destroy the identity of departments, and to cause confusion by using too universal a principle as a guide to sequence.

10. The first and most important problem of correlation is organization of parts within each of the departments of study; for, in a last analysis, correlation is important according as it is based upon perceivable and essential causal relations, as opposed to artificial or sentimental ones. Viewed in this way, it must be apparent that, on the whole, the relations that give sequence and coherence to a department of study are more essential and interesting than occasional cross-relations that may be found between different studies.

11. The correlation of departments is useful, however, because of the increased understanding and interest on the part of the child, and because of its value in educating the child to consistent and forceful conduct.

12. Literature is useful in bringing the aesthetic and the intellectual into helpful association.

13. Geography is the most universal, concrete correlating study, and perhaps more than any other may follow the lead of the other branches.

VII

Colonel Francis W. Parker on Herbartianism

(From *First Supplement to the Yearbook of the National Herbart Society*, 1895, pp. 153-155.)

No subject was ever brought into the American schools that furnishes so much food for thought and such abundant means for discussion as the subject we call "Herbartianism." The distinguished teachers who have spent several years at Jena studying, under the famous Dr. Rein, are, to say the least, full of the subject, full of the doctrine of correlation and concentration. Herbartianism, as I understand it, means earnest and unlimited study of the great sub-

ject of education and honest, earnest, fair discussion. The Herbartian doctrine is a working hypothesis to be examined, accepted in part or whole, or to be wholly rejected.

Herbart was a psychologist, he was what the Germans call a *Bahnbrecher.* He tried to discover a psychology that could be applied in schoolroom work. He was the founder of rational psychology. Out of Herbartianism has grown the great movement of physiological psychology which is now culminating in child study.

No doubt the Herbartian doctrine is full of mistakes and errors; but it proposes to reach the child's mind, proposes to study the nature of that mind, proposes to suggest the best possible methods for mind growth. There are countless theories in vogue, which, as the Germans say, "*Schweben in der Luft.*" They are discussed and rediscussed, over and over again, books are written exposing the theories; but the poor children go on the same weary round of dead-form work. The real test and the true test of a theory is in its practice, in what it gives the child, what it leads the child to do.

We are not here, then, to accept the Herbartian doctrine as the great students of this doctrine present it to us; we are to study it, we are to examine it. As I have already said, it is, no doubt, the best working hypothesis ever presented for the study of teachers.

Our friends, the students of Herbart, emphasize the teaching of history and literature as a core, the center, of educational movement. We all agree that there is very much in history and literature. We can also thoroughly understand another very important fact,—that history and literature are a prominent means of adjusting the child to the society, to the state, to the government. Through history and literature a child can be made to believe in his own government and the society in which he is born.

History and literature, I repeat, are a powerful means of adjusting the child to the exact state of society in which he finds himself.

VIII

Parker on Nature Study *vs.* the Child as the Correlating Center of the Curriculum (1895)

(From the *First Supplement to the Yearbook of the National Herbart Society,* 1895, pp. 156-158.)

We have the question of the relative place of nature study and

claim—Mr. Jackman, who is to discuss this question, does not claim —that nature is the center. I wish to have these words written in italics: We do not claim that nature is the center, neither do we claim that history and literature are the center, *we do claim that the child is the center,* that this being, this highest creation of God, with its laws of body, mind, and soul, determines in itself, the very nature and condition of its growth. It is not a question then, with us, who in a loving, true spirit would criticise our friends, the Herbartians, of any subject being the center, but to simply bring to the front this Cinderella of education—nature study. It is to coördinate, to give nature study some place, in the curriculum, to make it one of the great means of human development. It may, or may not, equal history and literature, but it is of first importance. Please to understand our position, when I say again, that we do not claim nature as the central study. The study of nature has been the spectre, the horrible spectre, of those who would hold the human mind in subjection both in church and state. You all know with what tremendous opposition the doctrines of Darwin met; you all know how church and state, with their efficient instrument the pedant, have striven against the onward march of progress, have fought against the search for God's truth in his manifestation of Himself through the universe. We ask for some place, and indeed a great place, for this manifestation of the Eternal One through all His works, and the reason we give for the neglect of science studies in the school, throughout the ages of education, is the awful danger of human progress that confronted those with fixed beliefs and sordid interests.

There is a great study of man, we should call it ethnology, and the study of man is in truth one of the nature studies. History is a report of ethnology, or the development of man from the beginning, a report filled with untruths, a report written by fawners at the foot of thrones, and the obsequious admirers of great generals. The study of history requires the closest investigation. It is, indeed, an all-important study; but ethnology is the central study, let it be understood, and history is the record of ethnology. No one can have a liberal education, or even a movement toward education, without the study of history and literature. It has been a great headlight upon ethnological movements since the beginning.

But to say that we make history the center, make the special pleading on the part of dogmatists and vassals the center of a whole system of education, is, to my mind, incorrect—to disdain the direct revelation of God and take up that zigzag, imperfect movement of man.

The great difference between Froebel and Herbart may be found in the difference of appreciation of children and child life. Herbart's greatest mistake was his lack of recognition of the instincts and spontaneous activities of the child. To fail to understand the child is a fundamental failure. To fail to appreciate the action of the child's mind up to the school age, is a great mistake.

IX

The Theory of Culture Epochs in the Child and the Race (1895)

(From the *First Supplement to the Yearbook of the National Herbart Society*, 1895, pp. 188-191.)

Dr. C. C. Van Liew presented the following theses for discussion before the Schoolmasters' Club, at Bloomington, Ill., October 4 and 5, 1895.

1.

The child, in attaining a grasp of the social order and civilization into which it is born and the power to adjust itself to that order, *must* pass through those stages of spiritual development that have been essential in the evolution of the race.

This, the so-called 'theory of the culture epochs,' is an application to the physical development of the child of the theory of recapitulation which the doctrine of evolution regards as established for the physical development of the individual.

The theory may be argued from both the formal and the material points of view.

As to form, the analogy between individual and generic development may be briefly indicated as follows:

2.

(a) In both child and race, mental development proceeds from absorption in the mass of sense perceptions, through the highly imaginative or mythical and legendary interpretation of phenomena, to the high historical, philosophic, and scientific interpretation.

(b) In both child and race, the development proceeds from the grosser, uncontrolled forms of impulse, through stages of fickleness and caprice, of childish trust in the patriarchal guidance, of rebellion against the law and the lesson of necessary subjection to the law, and of rational insight into the fitness and voluntary self-subjection to the law, or autonomy.

(c). Similar lines of comparison may be drawn for the development of the interests and emotions which are, however, very closely associated with and implied in the intellectual and volitional development of the individual and the race.

As to material:

3.

The subject matter of development, *i.e.*, the stimulus to development found in both the natural and cultural environment, is very largely the same for the race and for the child, thus giving *occasion* for the parallelism of development.

4.

Education bespeaks for the child a natural development of his powers. In so doing it implies the possibility of a right principle of succession for the materials of instruction and the educative activities.

5.

The principles of succession that have thus far been applied may be briefly summed up as (1) the principle of the relative ease of acquisition, which is an imperfect attempt to recognize the limitations which the child places upon the formation of the curriculum, and (2) the principle of the logical unfolding of the subject matter, which recognizes the limitations that the nature of the subject places upon the formation of the curriculum.

6.

Neither of these, alone, can be made the chief principle of succession in the curriculum, for neither adequately meets the requirement of sympathy between the child and the materials that are to stimulate his development at any given stage.

7.

There is need of a more perfect principle of succession, (1) because of the imperfection of the principles stated in thesis V when taken alone, (2) to give unity and purpose to those materials that will best meet the requirements imposed by the child and the aim of instruction, (3) to meet and utilize the child's developing interests and impulses, and (4) to furnish the "leading motive" to the work of concentration.

8.

The principle that meets these requirements most satisfactorily is that of the culture epochs, since it seeks to recognize the growing interests and powers of the child by introducing organic wholes of subject matter corresponding in general to each successive stage of development, and looking toward the ultimate end of education.

9.

The application of the theory of the culture epochs is limited by the following facts: (1) Each child is born into the world with a constantly increasing store of inheritance, thus shortening, to a slight degree only, the range of recapitulation. (2) Progress in civilization and culture places about each child a somewhat changed environment. Hence, the child finds himself in a *present* environment, the present's expression of past ages, while at the same time following an order of spiritual development that characterized the earlier growth of the race. The modern environment tends, therefore, to hasten the development of the earlier stages, and to render the parallelism of the later stages less clearly marked.

10.

While the Theory of the Culture Epochs is still open to the researches of comparative history and psychology, it is sufficiently well established to admit of application in education, at least along the following lines:

(a) It calls for an historical movement in the curriculum, in which the chief theme shall be furnished by history and literature. (Cf. McMurry's *Special Method in History and Literature.*)

(b) It bespeaks for the selection of material in history and literature an emphasis of classic periods and classic products, and

their treatment as organic thought wholes. "Periods that no master described, whose spirit no poet breathed, are of little value to education," and "great moral energy is the effect of great scenes and entire unbroken thought masses" (Herbart).

(c) In that the Culture Epochs point to certain prominent phases of growth at different stages in the child's development, they at the same time suggest the most fitting and sympathetic mode of approach to the child.

(d) In that the Culture Epochs have distinctly in view the aim of education, in conjunction with the principle of concentration they seek to point all instruction and all school activities toward a fuller and more intelligent grasp of modern social and national order and institutions. Hence they suggest that method of treatment for all the branches of instruction, that shall ultimately place them in the light of their value for human power.

X

Rein's Curriculum-Program Based on Culture Epochs

(From the *First Yearbook of the Herbart Society for Scientific Study of Teaching*, 1895, p. 99.)

Rein accepts the movement for the curriculum furnished by the culture epochs, preferring, however, to preserve space for individual movement by withholding from all attempts to fix the limits of the culture epochs at any specific age. As we have already seen, these limits merely serve the purposes of analysis, and are in con-

<table>
<tr><th>School Year</th><th colspan="2">Materials of Instruction</th><th>General Character of Epochs</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td colspan="2">Folklore and Fairy Tales</td><td rowspan="4">Mythical and Heroic Mind</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td colspan="2">Robinson Crusoe</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">3</td><td>Sacred</td><td>Profane</td></tr>
<tr><td>Patriarchs and Moses</td><td>Thuringian Tales</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Judges and Kings</td><td>Nibelungen Tales</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>Life of Christ</td><td>Christianizing and Kaiser Period</td><td>Mediaeval Statebuilding Historic Mind</td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td><td>Life of Christ</td><td>Kaiser Period</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>7</td><td>Paul</td><td>Reformation</td><td rowspan="2">Social and Political Development. Scientific and Philosophic Mind.</td></tr>
<tr><td>8</td><td>Luther</td><td>Nationalization</td></tr>
</table>

sequence more or less arbitrary and narrow. It is the continuous unfolding of the life process that we are trying to assist with material that is in greatest sympathy with the child. Rein conceives of an arrangement of such materials for the German Volks-school as is indicated in general in the scheme presented. Brief and general as it is, the scheme speaks for itself.

XI

JOHN DEWEY ON THE CULTURE-EPOCH THEORY (1896)

(From a paper first published in the *Public-School Journal*, January, 1896. See also the *Second Yearbook of the National Herbart Society*, 1896, pp. 89-91.)

Now, there are two questions which I wish to raise here. First, what is the criterion or standard employed? Is it the succession of epochs in the race, or is it the development of instincts, of interest in the child? This may seem, to the wise, an unnecessary or a foolish question, but I have read the recent literature on the subject, and I cannot decide that the writers have fairly asked this question of themselves.

As long as we are dealing with the establishment of the correspondence as a *fact*, it is quite legitimate to shift from one side to the other, now taking the race, now taking the child. But when we come to the *educational* interpretation of this fact, not so! Only if these held an *exact* parallelism would this be possible. And the *exact* parallelism is confessedly absent.*

It does not seem to me that the upholders of the theory have clearly recognized that if the correspondence is not exact, the standard, educationally, is the sequence in the child, not in the race. It is a question of psychology, of child study, not of race history. To study first the race side, and finding certain epochs then to conclude to the same in the child is unjustifiable. Pressing the analogy with biological recapitulation as far as it can be pressed, two points stand out: (1) The process of recapitulation takes place biologically during the embryonic period, and many of the phases are exceedingly transitory. They are without any practical import at all, being of value simply to the scientific student—say, the "fish" phase. The analogy then would indicate that it is quite possible that the race-culture gamut is now, say within the first two

* It will be noted that I do not question the fact of correspondence in a general way.

or three years of child life, and that many or most of its phases are of no educational significance at all, however interesting they may be to the anthropologist. No one proposes that the mother shall modify her diet when the human embryo has reached the "fish" phase, or take any practical note of it. Why should we not follow the same principle in the social recapitulation? Is there not danger of arresting development at that point by making too much of it? Now, I do not go to this extent myself, but there is nothing in the principle, *from the side of the race development,* why we should not. (2) When the analogy is used, it must be with a profound recognition of the extent to which "short cuts" have developed in the human being (See Baldwin, *Mental Development,* pp. 21-28), and the extent to which these have modified the nature of the recapitulation.

Now, in the foregoing I am not questioning the correspondence "in general;" I am simply pointing out considerations which absolutely forbid us to begin from the side of race development and infer to child development. We must, in all cases, discover the epoch of growth independently in the child himself, and by investigation of the child himself. All the racial side can do is to suggest questions. Since this epoch was passed through by the race, it is possible we shall find its correlate in the child. Let us, then, be on the lookout for it. Do we find it? But the criterion comes back in all cases to the child himself. If this is admitted by the upholders of the theory, many who have thought they did not agree will find themselves agreeing. But to admit this, is to come near, dangerously near, to making the child the center.

Moreover, if we keep in mind the modification of the inherited structure to make it subservient to new function, still further changes must be introduced. Just as the visual center of the lower animals is represented in man, but no longer as a complete visual center, so the hunting social epoch is represented in the child, but no longer as the dominant, complete activity, but simply as one impulse among many, having a certain relative urgency.

This fact alone is enough to condemn giving one year out of eight years (one out of five to many) to the hunting epoch of social life—or anything but an incidental reference to it on a higher scale; here is the nomadic epoch and some (hypothetical) interest now cor-

responding. Shall we then make this interest supreme and study that epoch? Or, shall we recognize the *relative* part played by pastoral activities in *present* society—the grazing in Texas, in Dakota, etc.—and *then* call attention to the fact that whole peoples once lived in that way? The biological analogy—to say nothing of a common sense—would require the latter.

XII

Dewey on Concentration, Central Studies, and Culture Epochs in Curriculum-Making (1896)

(From the *Second Yearbook of the National Herbart Society*, 1896, pp. 93-95.)

The idea that history and literature are the basis of concentration has been assumed to be a necessary consequence of the culture-epoch theory. I hope the foregoing remarks have made it clear that they are not so connected; while, undoubtedly, they do follow at once from that interpretation of the theory which assumes that the parallelism is not between the life and interest of the epoch and the life and interest of the child, but between the life of the child and the products, or results, of the life of the epoch.

It seems strange to me that one can clearly recognize that *beginning* reading and writing are formal, dependent upon a content requiring expression, and then give to literature any other position. Literature is certainly not an entity by itself; it is expression, as much so, as beginning reading, and educative contact with it means first initiation into the activities and ideas which are expressed. It is as hopeless to get a real vital concentration to center about "literature" as it would be to get it to gather about drawing. Neither study is central, but each is radial, expressive of some core, some content which is not drawing, nor yet literature.

I may run the risk of shocking my readers still more, perhaps, by saying that a *direct* interest in history is also impossible. Children like stories, but stories are histories brought up to date—regarded as part of present life. Children are interested directly in present life, in the social conditions which exist all about them and with which they come in contact; and any genuine, any educative historic interest is simply a reflex of this interest in the *existing* social structure. If there be such a thing in the child as the nomadic interest, it finds its natural and direct prey not in the shifting hordes of semi-barbaric tribes as they wandered with the flocks

over a half barren territory, but in the railway and steamboat before his eyes, with their cargoes of oxen, and their migratory tribes from Germany and Ireland and the isles of the seas. Let this movement be realized and then there is a basis for considering other modes of movements, and other relationships between ox and man!

I have endeavored to point out that accepting the correspondence theory in general, it requires in its educational interpretation and bearings, first, to be investigated, verified, and controlled absolutely from the side of child-life; and secondly, to be utilized primarily from the side of the activities and ideas in society which now correspond to the dawning interest, and only secondarily from that of the historical products of these activities and ideas. Even if the last point is not admitted, I think it must be confessed that there is a gap in the existing argument, from the fact of corresponding epochs, to the study of the *products* of the race epoch; and that this gap needs to be filled before the theory is relieved of ambiguity and confusion and stands justified.

XIII

CHARLES A. MCMURRY ON CHILD'S ACTIVITIES AND GROWTH AS THE CORRELATING CENTER (1896)

(From the *Second Yearbook of the National Herbart Society*, 1896, pp. 96-97.)

Dr. John Dewey has made an important contribution to the discussion of the "Interpretation of the Culture Epoch Theory." He is not inclined to deny a general correspondence in the epochs of development of child and race, but seeks for a more definite and limited application of the theory.

So far as I can see at present, I am willing to accept Dr. Dewey's statement that "the standard, educationally, is the sequence in the child—not in the race," and that "the criterion comes back in all cases to the child himself." In the sense here implied, I regard the child's activities and growth the controlling thought—the center. (This, however, does not, in my judgment, settle the question whether history and literature or some other study or group should form the center of the school course.) The value of any epoch, therefore, will depend upon the degree of its correspondence to the child's present needs. Having established this central position and importance of the child, Dr. Dewey seems to desert it in his first

argument. He says: "Here is the nomadic epoch and some (hypothetical) interest now corresponding. Shall we then make this interest supreme and study that epoch? Or shall we recognize the *relative* part played by pastoral activities in *present* society—the grazing in Texas, in Dakota, etc.—and then call attention to the fact that whole peoples once lived in that way?" On what ground here may we substitute "present society" for the child's interest and the child's psychology?

The fundamental assumption is, that the child's need is paramount. Why, then, should the accidents of present society, grazing in Dakota and Texas, determine what a child's education shall receive? Even if the nomadic tendency were entirely absent in present society, it is supposable that the child's instinct and activities at some epoch may call for it. In any case it is an open question how far present society furnishes the activities and materials best suited to the child's needs. It is the best illustrations of any culture epoch, viewed from the standpoint of the child, which are needed, and not the poor examples which the past or present may furnish. The discussion of this point leads to a definite clearing up of the whole problem of education on its two important sides. First, the critics of the culture epochs theory insist that we shall not impose that theory and its products upon the child, but examine the child's activities and needs at any age and make this the basis of all experiment with educative materials. I accept this proposition. A second set of critics of the culture epochs theory come in and demand that present society and the *relative* part played by certain activities in present society shall determine their value for the child. I reply, "Hands off!" First find out what present society has to offer that the child needs. If the child is the center, the argument against imposing materials on him is just as strong on one side as on the other. Present society, just as past history, has a great many things for which the child has no use at all.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

(As Revised at the 1924 Meeting and Amended at the 1926 Meeting of the Society)

Article I

Name.—The name of this Society shall be "The National Society for the Study of Education."

Article II

Object.—Its purposes are to carry on the investigation of educational problems, to publish the results, and to promote their discussion.

Article III

Membership.—Section 1. There shall be three classes of members —active, associate, and honorary.

Section 2. Any person who is desirous of promoting the purposes of this Society is eligible to membership and shall become such on payment of dues as prescribed.

Section 3. Active members shall be entitled to vote, to participate in discussion, and under certain conditions, to hold office.

Section 4. Associate members shall receive the publications of the Society, and may attend its meetings, but shall not be entitled to hold office, or to vote, or to take part in the discussion.

Section 5. Honorary members shall be entitled to all the privileges of active members, with the exception of voting and holding office, and shall be exempt from the payment of dues.

A person may be elected to honorary membership by vote of the Society on nomination by the Board of Directors.

Section 6. The names of the active and honorary members shall be printed in the *Yearbook.*

Section 7. The annual dues for active members shall be $2.00 and for associate members, $1.50. The election fee for active and for associate members shall be $1.00.

Article IV

Officers.—Section 1. The Officers of the Society shall be a Board of Directors, a Council, and a Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2. The Board of Directors shall consist of six members of the Society and the Secretary-Treasurer. Only active members who have contributed to the *Yearbooks* shall be eligible to serve as directors.

Section 3. The Board of Directors shall be elected by the Society to serve for three years, beginning on March first after their election. Two members of the Board shall be elected annually (and such additional members as may be necessary to fill vacancies that may have arisen).

This election shall be conducted by an annual mail ballot of all active members of the Society. A primary ballot shall be secured in October, in which the active members shall nominate from a list of members eligible to said Board. The names of the six persons receiving the highest number of votes on this primary ballot shall be submitted in November for a second ballot for the election of the two members of the Board. The two persons (or more in the case of special vacancies) then receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.

Section 4. The Board of Directors shall have general charge of the work of the Society, shall appoint its own Chairman, shall appoint the Secretary-Treasurer, and the members of the Council. It shall have power to fill vacancies within its membership, until a successor shall be elected as prescribed in Section 3.

Section 5. The Council shall consist of the Board of Directors, the chairmen of the Society's Yearbook and Research Committees, and such other active members of the Society as the Board of Directors may appoint from time to time.

Section 6. The function of the Council shall be to further the objects of the Society by assisting the Board of Directors in planning and carrying forward the educational undertakings of the Society.

Article V

Publications.—The Society shall publish *The Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* and such supplements as the Board of Directors may provide for.

Article VI

Meetings.—The Society shall hold its annual meetings at the time and place of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Other meetings may be held when authorized by the Society or by the Board of Directors.

Article VII

Amendments.—This constitution may be amended at any annual meeting by a vote of two-thirds of voting members present.

MINUTES OF THE WASHINGTON MEETING OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 20 AND 23, 1926

I

The first meeting of the Society was held Saturday evening, February 20th, 8 P.M., at the Washington Convention Auditorium, and was a joint meeting with the Education Division of the National Safety Council.

Some 800 persons were assembled in this large auditorium when Dr. C. H. Judd, Chairman of the Board of Directors, called the meeting to order and introduced as presiding officer Hon. A. B. Meredith, Commissioner of Education for Connecticut.

The program as originally arranged was as follows:

I. "Safety as a National Problem."
Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

II. "Introducing the Yearbook on Safety Education."
Dr. Guy M. Whipple, Secretary of the Society, and Chairman of the Society's Committee.
(10 Minutes)

III. "The Safety Movement."
A. W. Whitney, Chairman of the Education Division, National Safety Council.
(20 Minutes)

IV. "How Springfield Handles Safety Education."
Zenos E. Scott, Superintendent of Schools, Springfield, Massachusetts.
(25 Minutes)

V. "Summary and Evaluation of Safety Education."
Dr. A. B. Meredith, Commissioner of Education for Connecticut, Hartford, Connecticut.
(20 Minutes)

Unfortunately, on account of a sudden change in his program of engagements, the Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, was unable to be present. To compensate for this shortening of the program, Dr. C. H. Judd followed Dr. Meredith and closed the program with a brief address dealing with the place of safety in the life of primitive and of modern man and the place of the safety movement in the schools.

II

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY MEETING

The second meeting of the Society was held in the same auditorium Tuesday evening, February 23rd, before a much larger audience, numbering approxi-

mately 2,500. Members of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association were the guests of the Society on this occasion and were represented on our platform by Supt. Frank W. Ballou and Mr. S. D. Shankland, President and Executive Secretary, respectively, of the Department of Superintendence.

The first part of the meeting, scheduled at 7:30, was begun about 7:40 P.M., when Dr. Judd introduced as presiding officer for the special anniversary program Mr. Charles McKenny, President of the Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich.

The special anniversary program, as planned, was as follows:

"REMINISCENSES OF THE QUARTER CENTURY"

Dr. Charles DeGarmo, Coconut Grove, Florida, Emeritus Professor of Education, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Dr. Paul H. Hanus, Professor Emeritus, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Mr. James H. VanSickle, Coral Gables, Florida.

Dr. DeGarmo, who was prevented by illness from attending, sent his remarks in the form of a letter which was read by his former pupil, the Secretary of the Society, Dr. Whipple. This letter was in two sections. Part 1 was entitled "How I Became a Herbartian—With Reservations" and dealt in an interesting manner with certain phases of the early days of the National Herbart Society. Part 2 was entitled "What an Emeritus Finds to Do in Florida" and recounted in a humorous vein Professor DeGarmo's activities with pen and with hoe in the sunny land of Florida.

Dr. Hanus was present and delivered his message to the Society in person.

A letter was next read from Professor Manfred J. Holmes, who was for some years Secretary of the Society.

The portion of the anniversary program which had been assigned to Mr. James H. VanSickle was devoted to the giving of a memorial tribute to Supt. VanSickle, which was prepared and presented by Supt. Randall J. Condon of Cincinnati on the basis of expressions which had been gathered by the Secretary from various members of the Society who were best acquainted with Dr. VanSickle. Among those who thus contributed to the material presented by Mr. Condon were Supt. Payson Smith of Massachusetts, Supt. Albert Cook of Maryland, Mr. A. E. Winship of Boston, and Mr. Henry F. West, formerly Superintendent of Schools at Baltimore, in whose home at Miami Dr. VanSickle died suddenly on February twelfth.

Following this special program, the meeting was given over to the charge of Mr. J. H. Beveridge, Superintendent of Schools of Omaha, Nebraska, and the program, which was devoted to a discussion of Part II of the Twenty-Fifth Yearbook of the Society, entitled "Extra-Curricular Activities," was carried out according to the following schedule:

I. "Introducing the Yearbook on 'Extra-Curricular Activities.'"
Dr. L. V. Koos, Professor of Secondary Education, College of Education, University of Minnesota, and Chairman of the Society's Committee.

II. "The Social Values of Extra-Curricular Activities."
A. L. Threlkeld, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Denver, Colorado.

III. "Extra-Curricular Activities as a Means of Guidance."
Dr. H. D. Kitson, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

IV. "Curricularizing Extra-Curricular Activities."
Merle Prunty, Principal, High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

V. "Procedures in Evaluating Extra-Curricular Activities."
Dr. George S. Counts, Professor of Secondary Education, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

VI. Discussion and Summary, arranged by Dr. L. V. Koos.

The sixth item on the program as arranged by Dr. Koos included five-minute discussions of this Yearbook by S. A. Courtis, who spoke on "The Contribution of Extra-Curricular Activities to Methods of Teaching;" Otis Caldwell, who spoke on "Curricularizing the Activities of Elementary Schools;" Harold O. Rugg, who spoke on "Curricularizing Activities;" and E. K. Fretwell, who spoke on "To Curricularize or Not to Curricularize."

The four or five hundred persons who stayed through this rather long program felt repaid by these vigorous discussions.

III

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING

Immediately after the foregoing program was held the business meeting of the Society, at which the following matters were presented:

(1) The Board of Directors recommended that Article IV, Section 3, of the Constitution be amended by substituting "March" for "January," so as to read "The Board of Directors shall be elected by the Society to serve for three years, beginning on March 1st after their election." The Secretary explained that the work of the Directors fell naturally into periods which extended from one annual meeting to the next, so that the change of membership on January 1st broke the continuity of the work of the Board and interfered with the election of a chairman. On motion, this amendment was carried unanimously.

(2) The Board of Directors recommended that Article III, Section 7, of the Constitution be amended by substituting "$1.50" for "$1.00," so as to read "The annual dues for active members shall be $2.00 and for associate members $1.50."

It was explained that this amendment was recommended by the Board to discourage persons who joined the Society for one year only in order to secure one yearbook at a price less than offered through the usual commercial channels, and also to bring it about that the more or less shifting group of associate

members should carry proportionately more of the financial load than the active members. On motion, this amendment was unanimously adopted.

(3) For the sake of clearness it was also moved and adopted that this amendment should first become operative when the dues were paid for the 1927 Yearbooks.

(4) It was moved and carried unanimously that the Secretary send to the family of Supt. VanSickle an account of the memorial tribute which had been presented before the Society earlier in the evening by Supt. Condon.

On motion, the Society adjourned.

GUY M. WHIPPLE, *Secretary.*

HONORARY AND ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

(This list includes all active members for 1926 enrolled up to October 9, 1926.)

HONORARY MEMBERS

DeGarmo, Charles, Coconut Grove, Fla.
Dewey, John, Columbia University, New York City.
Hanus, Paul H., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Adams, Jesse E., College of Education, Lexington, Ky.
Alderman, Grover H., School of Educ., Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Alexander, Carter, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y.
Alger, John L., Normal School, Providence, Rhode Island.
Alleman, S. A., Supt. of Schools, Napoleonville, Louisiana.
Allen, Fiske, State Normal School, Charleston, Illinois.
Allison, Dr. Samuel B., Dist. Supt. in Charge of Special Schools, Board of Education, Chicago, Illinois.
Alltucker, Dr. Margaret M., 1201 16th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Almack, John C., Box 571, Stanford University, California.
Alter, Harvey E., Thomas Street School, Rome, New York.
Althans, Carl B., 5847 Blackstone, Chicago, Ill.
Anderson, Professor Elam J., Shanghai College, U.S.P.O. No. 964, Shanghai, China.
Anderson, Harold Albert, School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
Anderson, Mrs. Helen B., 414 W. Fayette St., Pittsfield, Ill.
Andrews, Benjamin R., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Angell, Miss L. Gertrude, The Buffalo Seminary, Bidwell Pkwy., Buffalo, New York.
Anspaugh, G. E., Komensky School, Chicago, Ill.
Antholz, H. J., Supervising Prin. City Schools, Spooner, Wis.
Anthony, Miss Katherine M., State Normal School, Harrisonburg, Virginia.
Archer, C. P., Department of Education, State Teachers College, Moorhead, Minnesota.
Arnold, E. J., Supt. of Schools, Huntsville, Ohio.
Arrowsmith, Miss Mary Noel, Educ. Sec. Nat. Safety Council, 120 West 42nd St., New York, N. Y.
Ashbaugh, Ernest J., Asst. Director, Bur. of Ed. Res., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Ashley, Myron L., 7113 Normal Blvd., Chicago, Illinois.
Augustin, Miss Eloise D., "The Maples," Otsego Co., Laurens, N. Y.
Avery, Geo. T., Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colorado.
Axtelle, George E., Prin., Honokaa Junior High School, Honokaa, Hawaii.
Ayer, Miss Adelaide M., Director of Training, State Normal School, Milwaukee, Wis.
Ayer, Fred C., University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
Ayer, Miss Jean Y., Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

Badanes, Saul, Public School 173, Pennsylvania Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.
Bader, Miss Edith M., Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Bagley, Dr. William C., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Baker, C. C., School Dist. No. 1, Grand Rapids, Minn.
Baker, Harry J., 100 E. Grand River Ave., Detroit, Mich.
Baldwin, Dr. Bird T., Iowa State University, Iowa City, Iowa.
Ballou, Frank W., Supt. of Schools, Washington, D. C.
Balyeat, F. A., 436 Stanford Ave., Mayfield, Calif.
Bamberger, Miss Florence E., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
Barber, Fred H., Emory and Henry College, Emory, Virginia.
Bardy, Joseph, 5626 Marine St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Barnes, Harold, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Barnes, Percival Simpson, Supt. of Schools, E. Hartford, Connecticut.
Barthelmess, Miss H. M., Dept. of Psychology, New Jersey State Normal School, Trenton, New Jersey.
Barton, W. A., Jr., Southeastern State Teachers College, Durant, Okla.
Baumgardner, Miss Nina E., 321 N. Egan Ave., Madison, S. Dak.
Bayles, E. E., Central Missouri State Teachers College, Warrensburg, Missouri.
Beatty, Willard W., Asst. Supt. Skokie School, Winnetka, Ill.
Beck, G. Herman, 3009a Victor St., St. Louis, Mo.
Bedell, Ralph C., Southwest High School, Kansas City, Missouri.
Bednar, Miss Christine, 132 West Marquette Road, Chicago, Illinois.
Beeby, Daniel J., 7646 S. Green St., Chicago, Illinois.
Bell, J. Carleton, 1032A Sterling Place, Brooklyn, New York.
Benedict, Ezra W., Greenwich, Washington County, New York.
Bennet, H. E., 5807 Blackstone Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
Bennett, H. G., Pres. Southeastern State Teachers College, Durant, Oklahoma.
Benson, Dr. C. E., New York University, Washington Square, New York City.
Benson, J. E., Principal, Eliot School, 4242 Grove St., St. Louis, Missouri.
Benton, G. W., 100 Washington Square, New York City, New York.
Berry, Miss Frances M., Kindergarten-Primary Supervisor, Dept. of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.
Betts, Miss Mary Tuite, 2847 Madison Road, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Beveridge, J. H., Supt. of Instruction, Omaha, Neb.
Bick, Miss Anna, 2842-A Victor St., St. Louis, Missouri.
Bickford, C. W., Supt. of Schools, City Building, Lewiston, Maine.
Birdsong, Miss Nellie W., Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Maryland.
Blue, Harold G., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
Board of Supts., c/o Arthur L. Gould, 15 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
Bobbitt, Franklin, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Bolton, Frederick E., University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
Border, Miss Clara V., Sidney, Ohio.
Bordner, H. A., The Supt. of City Schools, Manila, Philippines.
Bossing, Nelson L., Head Dept. of Education and Psychol., Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa.
Bowen, Wayne F., Box 84, Compton, Calif.
Bowyer, Vernon, Budget Investigator, Board of Education, Administration Bldg., 650 S. Clark St., Chicago, Illinois.
Boyden, Wallace C., Teachers College, City of Boston, Boston, Mass.
Boyer, Charles, Superintendent of Schools, Atlantic City, New Jersey.
Boyer, Philip A., 6320 Lawnton Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Bracken, J., 122 N. Meramic, Clayton, Mo.
Brady, Miss Mary J., 3017 Lafayette Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.
Breckenridge, Miss Elizabeth, Louisville Normal School, Louisville, Kentucky.
Breed, Frederick S., 1224 East 57th St., Chicago, Illinois.
Brewer, Miss Anne T., 1945 E. 97th St., Cleveland, Ohio.

Brewer, John M., Bureau of Vocational Guidance, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Bridgett, Miss Alice E., Colony St. School, R.F.D. No. 1, Wallingford, Conn.
Briggs, Dr. Howard L., Director of Vocational Educ., Board of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Briggs, Dr. Thomas H., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Brinkley, Sterling G., Emory University, Georgia.
Brinser, Ira S., Supt. of Schools, Newark, Del.
Brogue, Arthur, 3428 Kimbark, Chicago, Illinois.
Brooks, Fowler D., The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
Brooks, John D., Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.
Brown, Gilbert L., Marquette, Michigan.
Brown, J. C., President State Normal School, St. Cloud, Minnesota.
Brown, J. Stanley, President State Normal School, DeKalb, Illinois.
Brown, Miss M. Ethel, 202 Parkwood Blvd., Schenectady, N. Y.
Brown, Miss Stella E., 7 Belmar Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Brown, Dr. Wesley L., Director of Research, New Trier Township High School, Kenilworth, Illinois.
Brown, W. O., 406 Beveridge St., Carbondale, Illinois.
Brueckner, Dr. L. J., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Buchanan, William D., 5511 Vernon Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.
Buchner, Edward F., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Buckingham, Dr. B. R., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Buckisch, W. G. M., P. O. Box 1274, Manila, P. I.
Buckner, C. A., School of Education, Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Burdge, Howard G., Prin. State Normal School, Fredonia, N. Y.
Burkard, William E., 3202 W. Dauphin St., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Burnham, Ernest, State Normal School, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
Buros, Francis C., Prin. School Dist. No. 12, Rosebud, Montana.
Buswell, G. T., School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
Butler, L. A., Supt. of Schools, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Butterworth, Julian E., Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
Byrne, Lee, 949 Camelia Ave., Baton Rouge, La.

Cameron, Norman W., Supt. of Schools, Pottstown, Pa.
Cammack, J. I., Supt. of Schools, Kansas City, Missouri.
Camp, Dr. H. L., Bureau of Educ. Measurements, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dakota.
Canine, Edwin N., Apt. 9, 525 S. 6th St., Terre Haute, Ind.
Capps, A. G., School of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.
Cardozo, F. L., 2109 Pa. Ave., Washington, D. C.
Carrothers, George E., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Carson, C. C., Director of Education, Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana.
Carter, Ralph E., Assoc. Prof. of Educ., Indiana University, Fort Wayne, Ind.
Castle, L. E., Supt. Public Schools, Stuart, Iowa.
Cattell, Dr. J. McKeen, Garrison, New York.
Cavan, Jordan, Assoc. Prof. Dept. of Educ., Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois.
Chace, S. Howard, 19 Thorndike St., Beverly, Mass.
Chadsey, Charles E., University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.
Chadwick, R. D., Morgan Park School, Duluth, Minnesota.
Chambers, Will G., State College, Pennsylvania.
Champlin, Prof. Carroll D., Southwestern State Normal Sch., California, Pa.
Chandler, Paul G., 130 Normal Ave., Kent, Ohio.
Charters, W. W., School of Educ., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Chew, Samuel L., Supt. District No. 9, 6th St. and Erie Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
Childs, Dr. H. G., Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Chiles, E. E., Prin. Dozier School, 5749 Maple Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Claffy, Miss Eleanor V., Northwest School, 15th and Race St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Clark, Donald Lemen, Asst. Prof. of English, Columbia University, 301 Business Bldg., New York City.
Clement, J. A., College of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Cleveland, Miss Catharine C., 4807 Greenwood Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
Cline, E. D., School Adm. Bldg., South Bend, Ind.
Cobb, Miss Margaret V., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, New York.
Cochran, T. E., Shorter College, Rome, Ga.
Cody, Frank, 1354 Broadway, Detroit, Michigan.
Coffman, Lotus D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Cole, C. E., R.F.D. 1, Temple, Pa.
Cole, Robert D., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, New Jersey.
Collier, Miss Genevieve L., Horton School, Port Chester, N. Y.
Collins, Irvin B., Supt. City Schools, Roundup, Montana.
Condon, Randall J., Supt. of Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Connor, William L. Director of Research, Board of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Cook, Albert S., Dept. of Education, Lexington & Liberty Sts., Baltimore, Maryland.
Cooke, Miss Flora J., Francis W. Parker School, 330 Webster Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
Cooley, Dr. H. C., Gunnison, Colorado.
Coon, Charles L., Supt. Wilson Co. and City Pub. Schools, Wilson, N. C.
Cooper, Homer E., Dean, Eastern Ky. State Teachers College, Richmond, Ky.
Cooper, William J., 3343 Kerckoff Ave., Fresno, California.
Coss, John J., Office of Dir. Summer Session, Columbia University, New York City, New York.
Counts, George S., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Courtis, Dr. S. A., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Courtright, Miss Jocelyn, 363 Ritter Ave., Indianapolis, Ind.
Cox, Philip W. L., School of Educ. N. Y. Univ., 32 Waverly Place, New York, N. Y.
Coxe, Dr. W. W., Bureau Educ. Measurements, State Dept. of Education, Albany, N. Y.
Coy, Miss Genevieve L., 1915 East 93rd St., Cleveland, Ohio.
Cram, Fred D., 2222 Clay St., Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Crewe, Miss Amy C., Baltimore Co. Public Schools, 300 Park Ave., Baltimore, Maryland.
Crissman, Supt. Geo. R., 411 So. Holden St., Warrensburg, Mo.
Crow, C. S., Rutgers College & State Univ. of New Jersey, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
Crowley, James A., John Winthrop School, Brookford St., Dorchester, Mass.
Cubberley, Ellwood P., Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Calif.
Cummings, F. S., 1117 Maryland, Milwaukee, Wis.
Cunliffe, R. B., College of City of Detroit, 4841 Cass Ave., Detroit, Michigan.
Cunningham, Resdon J., Helena, Mont.

Danforth, Miss May D., 2026 P. St., Sacramento, California.
Daughters, Freeman, University of Montana, Missoula, Montana.
Davidson, Percy E., Stanford University, California.
Davis, Homer, Director, Bureau of Bldg. Survey, Board of Educ., Educ. Admin. Bldg., 460 S. State St., Chicago, Ill.
Davis, C. O., 1030 Martin Place, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Davis, Courtland V., 1314 Holland Ave., Norfolk, Va.
Davis, Sheldon E., President State Normal College, Dillon, Montana.

Day, Miss Grace A., Meriden, Conn.
Deahl, J. N., University of West Virginia, Morgantown, West Virginia.
Dearborn, Walter P., 79 Fresh Pond Parkway, Cambridge, Mass.
Dearmont, Dr. Washington S., Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana.
DeGraff, Dr. M. H., Prof. of Educ., Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee, Fla.
DeLong, L. R., Asst. Supt. Ithaca Public Schools, Ithaca, N. Y.
Delph, G. E., 117 W. Monroe St., Phoenix, Ariz.
DeLuce, Miss Olive S., Missouri State Teachers Col., Maryville, Mo.
De Voss, Dr. J. C., Dir. Bur. of Res. & Extension, State Teachers College, San Jose, California.
Dewey, Henry B., 2 Park St., Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston 8, Mass.
Dickson, J. C., 3235 W. 57th St., Seattle, Washington.
Donovan, Prof. H. L., George Peabody Col. for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Doyle, Miss Mary E., Ingleside, 205 N. Tacoma Ave., Tacoma, Wash.
Duboc, Jessie L., Montana State Normal College, Dillon, Mont.
Dunkelberger, George F., Middleburg, Snyder Co., Pa.
Dunkle, John L., State Normal School, Frostburg, Md.
Dunn, Miss Fannie W., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

Earhart, Miss Lida B., Apt. 509, 2901 Connecticut Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Eby, Frederick, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
Eby, Harvey L., 367 N. Reno St., Los Angeles, California.
Eckles, Miss Mary Holedger, Rural School Supervisor, State Dept. of Education, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
Edgerton, Prof. A. H., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Edmonson, J. B., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Edmunds, H. H., Supt. of Schools, Clinton, Ill.
Edwards, H. E., Dept. of Education, Emanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mich.
Elliott, Charles H., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Elliott, Miss Lucy C., Board of Education, St. Louis, Missouri.
Ellis, A. Caswell, Assoc. Prof. Education, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
Ellis, Dr. C. C., Professor of Education, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania.
Ellis, W. D., Prin. Richmond Normal School, Richmond, Va.
Elson, William H., 633 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
Engelhardt, N. L., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Erffmeyer, Dr. C. E., Northwestern College, Naperville, Ill.
Ericson, Miss Helen, 51st and Wernold Road, Kansas City, Missouri.
Ernst, Miss L. R., Board of Education, St. Louis, Missouri.
Evans, Albert W., Phillips High School, 39th and Prairie Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
Evans, Miss Edna S., 33 Walter St., Salem, Massachusetts.
Evans, J. E., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Evenden, Dr. E. S., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

Fagan, Charles, Cascade School, Seattle, Washington.
Farrand, Max, The Commonwealth Fund, 1 East 57th St., New York City, New York.
Farrington, Frederic E., Chevy Chase School, Washington, D. C.
Feeney, T. L., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Feingold, Dr. Gustave A., Vice-Principal, Hartford Public High School, Hartford, Connecticut.
Felmley, David, President Illinois State Normal Univ., Normal, Illinois.
Fernald, Miss Mabel R., Vocation Bureau, Denton Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Ferriss, Emery N., Prof. of Educ., Rural Educ. Dept., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y.
Finkenbinder, E. O., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Finley, Dr. Charles W., The Lincoln School of Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, New York.
Firman, Sidney G., Supt. of Schools, Glen Ridge, N. J.
Fisk, Frank E., 111 Gibson St., Canandaigua, New York.
Flaa, Miss G. Louise, 2406 P. St., Sacramento, Calif.
Flanagan, Miss Mary W., Teacher of Exceptional Classes, 2514-15th St., Troy, N. Y.
Flanders, J. K., State Normal School, Oswego, N. Y.
Fleischmann, Miss Charlotte C., Sharon Hill, Pa., Box 153.
Fleming, Miss Mary Elspeth, Prin. Paia School, Paia, Maui, T. H.
Fletcher, Walter H., State Normal School, Oshkosh, Wisconsin.
Forney, E. B., 4814 College Ave., Indianapolis, Ind.
Foster, Dr. H. H., Head of Educ. Dept., Beloit Col., Beloit, Wis
Fowler, Miss Marie B., Supervisor, c/o Bd. of Educ., Kalamazoo, Mich.
Fowlkes, John Guy, Assoc. Professor of Educ., The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.
Frawley, Miss Honora M., 325 W. 45th St., New York, N. Y.
Frazee, Miss Laura, Asst. Supt. City Schools, 433 Kenneth Square, Baltimore, Maryland.
Freeman, E. N., 3715 Mead St., Denver, Colorado.
Freeman, Dr. Frank N., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
Frizzell, Bonner, Supt. Public Schools, Palestine, Texas.
Froman, Mrs. Lula C., Southwestern State Teachers Col., Weatherford, Okla.
Frost, Norman, Geo. Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee.
Frye, Ellis K., Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill.
Fuller, William D., Modesto Junior College, 528 Magnolia Ave., Modesto, Calif.

Gallup, Jackson, Principal School No. 18, North and Draper Sts., Rochester, New York.
Gambrill, Miss Bessie Lee, Graduate School, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.
Gambrill, J. Montgomery, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Ganders, Prof. Harry Stanley, State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
Gard, Willis L., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Gardiner, Ana L., Prin. Curtis School, 18 E. Caramillo St., Colorado Springs, Colo.
Gardner, C. A., Prin. North Side High School, 1817 Gould Ave., Fort Worth, Texas.
Garrison, H. A., Supt. of Schools, Lake Crystal, Minn.
Garver, F. M., 112 Bennett Hall, Univ. of Pa., Philadelphia, Pa.
Gates, Arthur I., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Gaylord, J. S., School of Speech, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
Gee, Miss Etta Q., Evanshire Hotel, Evanston, Ill.
Gelfillan, Mrs. W. J., 1707 Foster Ave., Memphis, Tenn.
Germane, C. E., Prof. of Educ., Missouri State Univ., Columbia, Mo.
Gerry, Henry L., Teachers College City of Boston, 625 Huntington Ave., Boston, Mass.
Geyer, Denton L., 5725 Kimbark Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
Gibson, C. E., Prin. Ravenna School, E. 68th St. and Ravenna Ave., Seattle, Wash.
Gift, Elmer B., Manhattan, Kansas.
Gilland, Thomas M., Supt. Donora Public Schools, Donora, Pennsylvania.
Githens, Supt. C. E., Administration Bldg., Wheeling, W. Va.

Glassbrook, Mrs. Tillie Hartung, R. F. D. No. 2, Box 569, Hayward, California.
Glasscock, Supt. Dewey G., Reinersville, Ohio.
Gleason, W. C., 2608 Highland Ave., Shreveport, La.
Goddard, Henry H., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Goetch, E. W., 115 East 15th St., Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Goggans, Miss Sadie, Super. Schools Parker Dist., Greenville, S. C.
Good, Dr. Carter V., Prof. of Educ. Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Goodier, Floyd T., Supt. of Schools, Bd. of Educ., Dist. No. 170, Cook Co., Chicago Heights, Ill.
Gosling, Thomas Warrington, Supt. of Schools, Dayton Street, Madison, Wis.
Gotke, Prin. G. W., 2606 Saunders Ave., San Antonio, Texas.
Gourlie, Wm. G., Secretary Teacher's Library, Board of School Trustees, Cor. Dunsmuir and Hamilton Sts., Vancouver, British Columbia.
Gray, Miss Olive, Asst. Supt., 17 Eighth Ave. East, Hutchinson, Kansas.
Grebey, Harry F., Prin. Green St. School, Hazleton, Pa.
Greene, C. A., 1516 Edmond St., St. Joseph, Mo.
Greene, Harry A., Extension Div. Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Greenman, G. M., State Normal School, 24 Turner St., Willimantic, Conn.
Greist, O. E., County Supt. Public Schools, Winchester, Ind.
Griffin, Lee H., Ginn & Co., 2301 Prairie Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Griffin, Miss Margery M., 5557 Pershing, St. Louis, Mo.
Grizzard, Miss Mabel, Principal, Central Ward School, Waxahachie, Texas.
Grizzell, E. D., Asst. Prof. of Secondary Educ., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Groves, Dr. J. W., Asst. Prof. of Education, Fresno State College, Fresno, Cal.
Gruenberg, Benjamin C., 418 Central Park, West, New York City.
Gwinn, J. M., Board of Educ., City Hall, San Francisco, Cal.

Hagen, H. H., 154 N. Lombard Ave., Oak Park, Ill.
Haggerty, M. E., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Hake, Miss Anna M., High School, 230 Springs Ave., Gettysburg, Pa.
Hall, George F., Supt. of Schools, High School, Grantwood, New Jersey.
Hall, John W., University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada.
Hall, Madison, Supt. of Schools, Bryan, Texas.
Halleck, Reuben Post, 1154 South Third Avenue, Louisville, Kentucky.
Hamilton, E. D., Prin. Cottage Ave. School, 4424 West Belle Place, St. Louis, Mo.
Hamilton, G. E., Ed. Manager Keystone View Co., Meadville, Pennsylvania.
Hamilton, Miss Katharine, Dept. of Educ. Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
Harap, Henry, Cleveland School of Education, Sterns Road, Cleveland, Ohio.
Hardy, Rose Lees, Asst. Supt. Franklin School Bldg., Washington, D. C.
Harrington, Professor Evalina, 1411 Montana St., El Paso, Texas.
Harris, Miss Alice L., Assistant Supt., Office of Supt. of Schools, Worcester, Massachusetts.
Harris, T. H., State Supt. of Schools, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
Hartman, R. M., 170 W. Franklin Ave., Ridgewood, N. J.
Harvey, Nathan A., 1029 Ellis Street, Ypsilanti, Michigan.
Haskell, Raymond I., 246 Broad St., Sewickley, Pa.
Hatch, Henry D., 1540 East Marquette Road, Chicago, Illinois.
Hatcher, W. B., Supt. of Schools, Board of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
Hatfield, W. E., 6030 Kenwood Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.
Hatfield, W. W., Head of Dept. of English, Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Illinois.
Hausauer, Miss Tillie W., 92 Wallace Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
Haviland, Walter W., Prin., Friends' Select School, The Parkway and 17th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Hawkins, Geo. L., 4300 Monganford Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Haycock, Asst. Supt. Robert L., 1606 Longfellow St., Washington, D. C.
Hayes, C. K., Supt. of Schools, City Hall, Muscatine, Iowa.
Hayes, Miss Mary Holmes Stevens, Director Vocational Service for Juniors, 112 East 25th Street, New York City.
Headley, Miss Minetta J., 414 Parham, Muscatine, Iowa.
Heckert, J. W., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Heckman, Dr. Samuel B., Educational Clinic, College of City of New York, New York City.
Heffelfinger, John B., Supt. of Schools, 720 E. 7th Street, Newton, Kansas.
Henderson, Mabel J., 910 West 5th St., Waterloo, Iowa.
Hendrix, H. E., Supt. Schools, Mesa, Arizona.
Henry, Lester J., Drawer V, San Luis Obispo, Calif.
Henry, T. S., Western State Normal School, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
Herron, Miss Helen, 1933 Elysian Fields Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Herron, Miss Lucile F., 1402 No. Ala. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Hewitt, Miss Alden, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.
Hill, Howard C., School of Educ., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Hill, Miss Patty S., Teachers Col., Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y.
Hill, William C., Prin. Central High School, Springfield, Massachusetts.
Hillegas, M. B., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Hirsch, Blanche, Prin. Alcuin Preparatory School, 48 West 86th St., New York, N. Y.
Hockett, John A., The Lincoln School of Teachers College, 425 W. 123rd St., New York, N. Y.
Hogan, Miss Frances M., 1016 Wood St., Houston, Texas.
Hoke, Kremer J., Dean, College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
Holley, Chas. E., Decatur Col. & Industrial Sch., Decatur, Ill.
Holmes, Henry W., Dean, Grad. School of Educ., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
Hood, E. A., Prin. Grant School, 729 Westgate Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Hook, T. E. Troy, Ohio.
Hopkins, L. Thomas, Associate Prof. of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.
Hopper, A. M., State Dept. of Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
Horn, Ernest, 934 Kirkwood Avenue, Iowa City, Iowa.
Horn, John Lewis, School of Education, Mills College, Oakland, California.
Horn, Miss Marion, 52 Collins St., Highwood, New Haven, Conn.
Hosic, James F., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Hotz, H. G., State Dept. of Educ., Little Rock, Ark.
Howard, F. E., Maui High School, Hamakuapoko, Maui, T. H.
Howard, George, County Supt. of Schools, Salisbury, N. C.
Howarth, Walter E., 1140 Allengrove St., Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hoyt, Franklin S., Houghton Mifflin Co., 2 Park St., Boston, 8, Mass.
Hudelson, Earl, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Hudson, J. Jones, Cleveland School of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Huffman, W. H., Prin. West Belle School, 1625 Arlington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Hughes, R. O., Peabody High School, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Hughes, W. H., 1058 N. Mentor, Pasadena, Cal.
Hull, Dr. Osman R., School of Education, Univ. of So. Cal., Los Angeles, Cal.
Huntington, Harold A., Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill.
Husted, Supt. M. F., Municipal Bldg., No. Bergen, N. J.
Hutson, P. W., Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Hyde, Clement C., Principal, Hartford Public High School, Hartford, Connecticut.

Immerzel, Supt. Henry M., Oakland, Iowa.
Ingler, Francis M., 674 Durkee, Appleton, Wis.

Irwin, R. B., American Foundation for the Blind, 41 Union Square, West, New York City.
Isanogle, A. M., Western Maryland College, Westminster, Maryland.

Jacobs, Ralph L., 140 W. 3rd and Grand Sts., Lewiston, Pa.
Jacobs, Walter Ballou, Director, School of Education, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.
Jeddeloh, Henry J., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Jeffers, Fred A., Supt. of Schools, Painesdale, Michigan.
Jeffrey, R. G., Prin., Sawyer Ave. School, Chicago, Ill.
Jemison, Margaret, Librarian, Emory University, Emory University, Georgia.
Johnson, A. W., Prin. Junior High School, Minot, N. Dak.
Johnson, Professor Franklin W., 60 Edgecliff Terrace, Yonkers, N. Y.
Johnson, Rev. George, Editor of "The Catholic Educational Review," 1222 Quincy St., N. E., Washington, D. C.
Johnson, Supt. Henry C., U. S. National Bank Bldg., San Diego, Cal.
Johnson, H. O., School Dist. Crystal Falls, Crystal Falls, Mich.
Johnson, Sexton, Superv. Prin., The Public Schools, P. O. Box 1001, Tampa, Fla.
Johnston, Miss Kathryn, P. O. Box 738, Helena, Montana.
Jones, Arthur J., Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Jones, Galen, Prin., Sapulpa High School, Sapulpa, Okla.
Jones, George Ellis, 73 Harwood Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Jordan, R. H., 121 Goldwin Smith Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
Judd, Charles H., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
Jung, Miss Elizabeth, 97 East Lane Ave., Columbus, Ohio.

Katterjohn, H., Elmhurst, Ill.
Kaufmann, Miss Myrtle L., Elementary Supervisor, Logansport Public Schools, Logansport, Indiana.
Keating, Supt. John Francis, 1627 Carteret Ave., Pueblo, Colorado.
Keator, Miss Maud, State Dept. of Education, Hartford, Conn.
Keener, E. E., 460 So. State St., Chicago, Ill.
Keith, Allen P., 20 Locust Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts.
Keith, Miss Edna, Elementary Supervisor, Joliet, Illinois.
Kelley, Prof. Truman L., Stanford University, Stanford, California.
Kelly, F. J., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Kelsey, Mrs. Minnie Carson, 1096 Hillside Ave., Stratford, Conn.
Kemp, W. W., University of California, Berkeley, California.
Kent, Raymond A., Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
Keys, Noel, International House, 500 Riverside Drive, Box 408, New York, N. Y.
Kiefer, Miss Frieda, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.
Kilpatrick, Prof. W. H., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Kimmel, W. G., School of Educ., Univ. Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Kirby, Thomas J., Prof. of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Kirk, John R., Kirksville, Missouri.
Kirven, Miss Ann L., The South Texas State Teachers College, Kingsville, Texas.
Kitson, Harry D., Teachers Col., Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y.
Kline, Chas. W., East High School, Waterloo, Iowa.
Knights, Miss Maude Daisy, 1302 Harvard Blvd., Toledo, Ohio.
Koch, H. C., Research Asst. Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio.
Kohs, Samuel C., Oakland Jewish Federation, 732-14th St., Oakland, Cal.
Koontz, Norman C., Supt. of Schools, Titusville, Pennsylvania.
Koos, Frank H., Asst. Supt. City Public Schools, Winston-Salem, N. C.
Koos, Leonard V., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Krackowizer, Miss Alice M., 15 Cedar Place, Yonkers, N. Y.
Kuehn, Miss Nita E., 2708 Clark Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Langworthy, Harry W., 8 High St., Gloversville, N. Y.
Lantrip, Miss Dora B., 4525 McKinney Ave., Houston, Texas.
Laramy, Robert E., Supt. of Schools, Altoona, Pa.
Larson, J. A., 1622 Woodrow, Little Rock, Ark.
Latham, R. H., Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
Layton, S. H., 285 W. Williams St., Delaware, Ohio.
Layton, Warren K., Asst. Prin. Foch Intermediate School, 2962 Fairview Ave., Detroit, Mich.
Leath, Miss Mary, 1598 Carr Ave., Memphis, Tenn.
Lebeis, Miss Clara D., Primary Supervisor, Dept. of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota.
Lessenger, W. E., Detroit Teachers College, Detroit, Mich.
Lewis, Fred D., Lincoln Junior High, Minneapolis, Minn.
Light, N. S., State Board of Education, Hartford, Conn.
Ligon, M. E., 658 South Lime, Lexington, Ky.
Lindley, Harlow, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
Linn, George I., Manteca Union High School, Manteca, Cal.
Littlejohn, M. L., Pres., Central Senior High School, Sioux City, Iowa.
Livesay, T. M., Professor of Educ. & Psychology, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.
Lockwood, Miss Jessie M., Prin. John Muir School, Seattle, Washington.
Logan, Miss Anna E., Ass't Supt. Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Longshore, W. T., 520 West Fortieth Street, Kansas City, Missouri.
Longstreet, R. J., Daytona Beach Public Schools, P. O. Peninsula Station, Daytona, Florida.
Lord, L. C., Pres. Eastern Ill. State Teachers College, Charleston, Ill.
Lough, James E., Dean of New York University, 32 Waverly Place, New York City.
Lowry, Charles D., 1643 Touhy Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Luchs, Miss Bertha, 606 West 113th Street, New York City.
Luckey, Miss Bertha M., Board of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Ludden, Wallace, Dept. of Educ., Barringer School, Rome, N. Y.
Lull, H. G., Kansas State Normal, Emporia, Kansas.
Lutes, O. S., 924 E. Washington St., Iowa City, Iowa.
Lyons, Miss Sarah A., School Committee Rooms, 15 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

McCarthy, J. C., 789 Orange Street, New Haven, Connecticut.
McCormick, Firman S., Supt. of Schools, Huron, Ohio.
McCormick, J. Scott, Bureau of Education, Manila, Philippine Islands.
McDonald, Mary I., 157 W. Kingsbridge Road, New York City.
McDonald, Robert A. F., Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.
McDonnell, E. L., 3214 17th Ave. So., Seattle, Wash.
McFarland, George A., Pres. State Normal School, Minot, North Dakota.
McKenna, Miss Ella, Supervisor of Art, S. S. Dist., 321 Amabell St., Mt. Washington, Pittsburgh, Pa.
McKinney, James, American School, Drexel Ave., and 58th St., Chicago, Illinois.
McMullin, Walter G., 17th and Pine Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Mabrey, F. D., Prin., Englewood Intermediate School, Englewood, N. J.
MacGillivray, Malcolm E., 405 Oak Park Ave., Visalia, Calif.
MacKay, James L., 3640 Shaw Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
MacMillan, D. P., 460 S. State Street, Chicago, Illinois.
MacQuarrie, T. W., Univ. of So. California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Magill, Walter H., 117 Bennett Hall, U. of Pa., Philadelphia, Pa.
Manahan, J. L., University of Virginia, University, Virginia.
Manry, James C., Erwin Christian College, Allahabad, India.

Mantel, Herman E., 1140 Woodycrest Ave., The Bronx, N. Y.
Manuel, H. T., University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
Marguerita, Sister, St. Ursula's Academy, Toledo, Ohio.
Markowitz, Martha B., Supervisory Asst. Waring School, E. 31st nr. Payne, Cleveland, Ohio.
Marrs, S. M. N., State Supt. of Public Instr., Austin, Texas.
Martin, Geo. A., Sec., Stuart Public Schools, Stuart, Iowa.
Martin, T. J., Prin., Lincoln Grammar School, Honolulu, T. H.
Mason, E. G., Dept. History, Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio.
Masson, J. S., Ass't to Supt. of Schools, Lorain, Ohio.
Masters, J. G., Prin., Central High School, Omaha, Neb.
Maxwell, Dean C. R., The University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.
Mayberry, Lawrence W., Wichita, Kansas.
Maynard, M. M., Department of Education, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.
Mead, Arthur R., Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
Mead, Cyrus D., University of California, Berkeley, California.
Meek, Charles S., Supt. of Schools, Toledo, Ohio.
Meek, Miss Lois Hayden, Educational Sec., 1634 I St., Washington, D. C.
Melcher, George, Library Bldg., 9th and Locust Streets, Kansas City, Missouri.
Melchior, Wm. T., Teachers College, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
Mellyn, Miss Mary C., c/o School Committee, 15 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Mendenhall, Edgar, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas.
Meredith, A. B., Commissioner of Education, Hartford, Conn.
Meriam, J. L., Univ. of California, Los Angeles, Cal.
Merrill, John, District Principal, 1526 Garland, Detroit, Michigan.
Mildred, Sister M., Our Lady of Angels, Glen Riddle, Del. Co., Pa.
Miller, C. S., Latrobe, Pennsylvania.
Miller, Irving E., State Normal School, Bellingham, Wash.
Miller, Lawrence Wm., R. R. No. 2, Lewiston, Idaho.
Miller, W. S., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Mills, Miss Harriette M., 63 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
Minnich, H. C., State Normal College, Oxford, Ohio.
Moehlman, A. B., School of Educ., Univ. of Mich., Ann Arbor, Mich.
Monroe, Walter S., University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.
Moore, Miss Annie E., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Moore, Clyde B., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y.
Moore, Miss Dora M., 1027 Emerson St., Denver, Colorado.
Moore, Miss Helen J., 1834 13th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Moore, Miss Maud, The Rockfall, 545 W. 111th St., New York, N. Y.
Moore, Miss Nelle E., State Normal School, Bloomsburg, Pa.
Moore, Wm. L., Principal, Longwood Commerce High School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Morgan, Grover, Summerland College, Batesburg-Leesville, S. C.
Morgan, Walter E., Prin. Washington Elem. School, Berkeley, California.
Morris, J. V. L., 925 Center St., Alva, Okla.
Morrison, H. C., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
Morrison, J. Cayce, Dept. of School Administration, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Morse, Miss Lucia B., Downer's Grove, Illinois.
Mort, Paul, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y.
Morton, C. A., Municipal Bldg., Town of Union, N. J.
Morton, R. L., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Morton, William M., 330 East 22nd Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Mossman, Miss Lois Coffey, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y.
Moyers, A. Edison, Supt. Public Schools, Sidney, Iowa.
Muench, Supt. J. F., Mountain Iron, Minn.
Muerman, J. C., State Teachers College, Durant, Oklahoma.

Mugan, Miss Mary A. S., Asst. Supt. Schools, Fall River School Dept., Fall River, Massachusetts.
Munson, Oscar F., 1016 Heliotrope Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.
Murphy, Miss Agnes, 557 Cramer St., Milwaukee, Wis.
Murphy, Miss Eleanor J., 27 Rosline St., Dorchester, Mass.
Myers, George E., Sch. of Educ. Univ. of Mich., Ann Arbor, Mich.

Nagle, J. Stewart, Box 373, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Nash, H. B., West Allis Public Schools, West Allis, Wis.
Neulen, Leon N., 5 Iona Place, Glen Rock, N. J.
Neverman, P. F., Marinette, Wis.
Newlon, Jesse H., Supt. of Schools, Denver, Colo.
Nichols, C. A., So. Methodist Univ., Dallas, Texas.
Nicholson, Miss Nell Grant, 6410 San Bonita Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Noble, Stuart G., Department of Education, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana.
Noonan, Margaret E., Prof. Sch. of Educ., New York Univ., Washington Sq., New York, N. Y.
North, Ward T., Supt. of Schools, Corydon, Iowa.
Norton, John K., The National Educ. Assn., 1201 16th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Nuttall, Dean L. John, 360 No. Univ. Ave., Provo, Utah.

Obuch, W. A., Lamont, Okla.
Olson, Miss Nellie R., 312-5th Avenue, West, Faribault, Minnesota.
O'Neil, Joseph A. F., Prescott School, Elm St., Charlestown, Mass.
Oppenheimer, J. J., Dean, Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.
Osburn, W. J., Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison, Wis.
Otis, Miss Flora E., Director, State Normal and Training School, Oswego, N. Y.
Ottermann, Charles, 3301 Observatory Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Otto, William A., Prin., Kerman Union High School, Kerman, Cal.
Owen, Dr. R. D., Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Park, M. G., State Normal School, Cortland, N. Y.
Patrick, Miss Mary, 6030 Kimbark Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Patterson, E. S., 725 North 14th Street, Keokuk, Iowa.
Patterson, Dr. Herbert, Dean of School of Education, Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma.
Patterson, Miss Mildred V. W., 1710 Sixth St., Rensselaer, N. Y.
Patty, W. W., Asst. Prof. Educ., Indiana Univ., Bloomington, Ind.
Paul, Francis H. J., Prin., DeWitt Clinton High School, 500 W. 59th St., New York, N. Y.
Pauly, Frank R., Sand Springs, Oklahoma.
Payne, E. George, School of Education, New York University, Washington Sq., New York, N. Y.
Pechstein, L. A., School of Education, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Pendleton, Charles S., George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Penfold, Arthur, 332 Beard Avenue, Buffalo, New York.
Perkins, George W., 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.
Perley, S. Todd, Supervising Principal Avalon Public Schools, Pittsburg, Penn.
Perrine, C. H., Lake View High School, Chicago, Ill.
Peters, Chas. C., Prof. of Education, Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Delaware, Ohio.
Peters, C. W., Ass't Supt. Allegheny County Schools, Room 595 Union Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Pfeiffer, Otto A., Prin., Joel Chandler Harris Jr. School, Pruitt Ave., and Halstead St., San Antonio, Texas.
Phelan, W. W., 536 Chautauqua Street, Norman, Oklahoma.

Philhower, Chas. A., Westfield, New Jersey.
Phillips, J. J., 611 E. 5th Ave., Lancaster, Ohio.
Phillips, Miss Mary F., 921 Lincoln Way, East, Mishawaka, Indiana.
Pierce, Miss Mary D., Division of Teacher Training, Dept. of Education, Montgomery, Alabama.
Pillsbury, W. H., Board of Education, Buffalo, New York.
Pintner, Rudolph, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Piper, Ernest E., 63 E. Hancock Ave., Detroit, Mich.
Pittenger, B. F., University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
Pittman, M. S., Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Michigan.
Pollard, Luther John, Head of Dept. of Education, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.
Porter, David C., State Normal School, Slippery Rock, Pa.
Power, Leonard, 4315 Ross Ave., Dallas, Texas.
Powers, J. Orin, Col. of Educ., George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
Powers, S. R., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Pratt, O. C., Administration Bldg., Spokane, Washington.
Prince, Mrs. Winifred N., 1414 Wendell Ave., Schenectady, N. Y.
Proctor, Milton D., Supt. of Schools, Uniontown, Pa.
Proctor, Wm. M., Box 41, Stanford University, Cal.
Prunty, Merle, Prin. Central High School, Tulsa, Okla.
Pryor, Hugh C., Northern Normal and Industrial School, Aberdeen, South Dakota.
Puckett, Roswell C., Benj. Bosse High School, Evansville, Ind.

Quinn, James J., Supt. of Schools, Winchester, Mass.

Race, Miss Henrietta V., Board of Education, Youngstown, Ohio.
Radcliffe, Paul R., Supt. of Schools, Nutley, New Jersey.
Rader, L. W., 911 Locees Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Radley, Arthur A., Deposit High School, Deposit, N. Y.
Rall, E. E., Pres. and Prof. of Education, Northwestern College, Naperville, Ill.
Ramsdell, Miss Maude, 102 N. Hamilton, Ypsilanti, Mich.
Rankin, P. T., 1354 Broadway, Detroit, Michigan.
Raubenheimer, Dr. A. S., Univ. of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal.
Rawdon, Howard L., Supt. of Schools, Oberlin, Ohio.
Rearick, Miss Anna J., 2715 Olive St., St. Joseph, Mo.
Reavis, W. C., University of Chicago High School, Chicago, Illinois.
Rector, Miss Lizzie E., 283 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.
Reed, Miss Mary M., Teachers Col., Columbia Univ., 509 W. 121st St., New York, N. Y.
Reed, R. L., 814 N. 9th Street, Keokuk, Iowa.
Reeve, William D., Apt. 92, 106 Morningside Drive, New York, N. Y.
Reeves, F. W., Prof. of Educ., Univ. of Ky., Lexington, Ky.
Reid, O. L., 20 West Wood Street, Youngstown, Ohio.
Reynolds, O. E., Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.
Rhoads, Luke C., Supervisor of Instruction, Dept. of Public Instruction, 60 South 3rd Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Rhoton, Prof. A. L., Pennsylvania State College, Box 403, State College, Penn.
Richardson, Ira, Alamosa, Colorado.
Rinsland, Henry O., Bureau of Educ. Res., Univ. Okla., Norman, Okla.
Risley, James H., Supt. School Dist. No. 1, Pueblo, Colo.
Ritter, Elmer L., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Robbins, Charles L., Prof. of Educ., S. U. of I., 1049 Woodlawn, Iowa City, Iowa.

Roberts, Geo. L., Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.
Robinson, Thomas H., 71 Clinton St., Waterbury, Conn.
Rockey, D. W., Director of Research, State Dept. of Education, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
Rogers, Miss Agnes L., Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.
Rogers, Don C., Chicago Principals Club, 315 Plymouth Court, Chicago, Ill.
Rogers, L. B., 1210 W. 27th St., Los Angeles, Cal.
Roland, Mrs. Victoria Clay, 404 Bowen Ave., Apt. 2, Chicago, Ill.
Rollins, Miss Ida M., 51 Summit Ave., Jersey City, N. J.
Root, A. R., 15 E. Bloomington St., Iowa City, Iowa.
Root, Charles C., State Normal School, Buffalo, N. Y.
Rosier, Joseph, Pres. Normal School, Fairmont, West Virginia.
Ross, C. C., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
Rowell, Arthur, B., Supt. Schools, 400 Washington Avenue, Glencoe, Illinois.
Rowland, Albert Lindsay, Dept. of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa.
Rowland, Sydney, V., Supt. Radnor Public Schools, Wayne, Pennsylvania.
Roy, Victor Leander, Natchitoches, Louisiana.
Ruch, G. M., Haviland Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Ruediger, W. C., George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
Rufi, John, Prof. of Education, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.
Rugg, Earle U., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado.
Rugg, Harold Ordway, Lincoln School of Teachers Col., Columbia University, New York City.
Ruggles, Allen M., University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.
Rugh, C. E., Haviland Hall, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, California.
Rynearson, Edward, Prin. Fifth Avenue High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Sachs, Dr. Julius, 225 West 86th Street, Columbia University, New York City.
Sailer, T. H. P., Englewood, New Jersey.
Sanders, Mary Shipp, 3rd Asst. Supt., State Dept. of Education, Austin, Texas.
Sanger, William T., Pres. Medical College of Va., Richmond, Va.
Sargeant, Miss Ide G., Prin., Public School No. 10, Paterson, N. J.
Saul, J. H., Peabody High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Saunders, Joseph H., 324 57th Street, Newport News, Virginia.
Sauvain, Nelson, Devils Lake, North Dakota.
Schlagle, F. L., Asst. Supt. Library Bldg., Kansas City, Kansas.
Schmidt, Miss Clara H., South Gate, Crestwood, N. Y.
Schmieding, Alfred, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.
Schnieb, Miss Anna A., 311 South Second Street, Richmond, Kentucky.
Schumacher, Very Rev. Matthew, Pres. St. Edward's College, Austin, Texas.
Schwegler, Raymond A., Prof. Educ. Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.
Schweickhard, Philip, Supt. School District, No. 24, Biwalik, Minnesota.
Schweickart, Supt. E. F., 1049 Hazel St., Fremont, Ohio.
Scott, F. A., 31 Blake Street, Belmont, Massachusetts.
Scott, Miss Flora L., East 194th Street, Collinwood Station, Cleveland, Ohio.
Scott, Supt. Z. E., Springfield, Mass.
Sealock, W. E., Station A, Box 1372, Lincoln, Neb.
Searles, Clair K., M. E. Mission, Peking, China.
Sears, J. B., Stanford University, Calif.
Seese, Norman A., The Church of the Brethren Mission, Liao Chow, Shansi, China.
Selke, George A., 421 W. 118th St., New York, N. Y.
Sellew, Supt. Edward B., Middletown, Connecticut.
Sexson, J. A., Bisbee, Ariz.
Shankland, Sherwood D., 1201 Sixteenth St, N. W., Washington, D. C.
Shaw, L. R., Prin. John B. Allen School, Phinney Ave. bet. 66th and 67th Sts., Seattle, Wash.

Shea, Frank P., Prin. Mt. Pleasant School, New Bedford, Mass.
Shepherd, Fred S., Supt. of Schools, Passaic, N. J.
Short, Clarence A., Supt. of Schools, Laurel, Delaware.
Shott, John A., Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.
Shotwell, Fred C., 1 School Place, Franklin, New Jersey.
Shurtleff, Oliver, Supt. of Schools, Sutton, West Virginia.
Sickles, F. J., Supt. Public Schools, New Brunswick, N. J.
Siepert, Albert F., Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill.
Simmonds, E. S., Prin., Bellflower Township High School, Dist. 311, Bellflower, Illinois.
Simmons, Mrs. Christine K., 606 Swan St., Dunkirk, N. Y.
Simpson, B. R., Cleveland School of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Singleton, Gordon G., Director, Div. Statistics and Information, Dept. of Education, Atlanta, Ga.
Slauson, Herbert M., 433 S. Fifth Ave., Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Slutz, Frank D., Moraine Park School, Box 782, Dayton, Ohio.
Smart, Frank L., Supt. of Schools, Davenport, Iowa.
Smiley, Wm. H., Ass't Supt. Schools, Commonwealth Bldg., Denver, Colorado.
Smith, Aubrey G., Box 920, Stanford University, Calif.
Smith, B. Glen, Head, Dept. of Educ., The Dixie College, Saint George, Utah.
Smith, Eugene R., Beaver Country Day School, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Smith, Dean H. L., School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Smith, Harry P., University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.
Smith, Jesse L., 141 So. 2nd St., Highland Park, Ill.
Smith, Leon O., Ass't Supt. of Schools, 602 City Hall, Omaha, Nebraska.
Smith, L. W., Joliet Township High School, Joliet, Ill.
Smith, Mrs. Margaret M., Principal, Maria Mitchell School, Denver, Colorado.
Smith, Miss Nila B., Dept. Instructional Research, Detroit, Mich.
Smith, William F., 1810 N. B. St., Elwood, Ind.
Smoot, Miss Lucy J., 4011 Baltimore, Kansas City, Mo.
Snarr, O. W., State Teachers College, Mankato, Minn.
Snyder, Raymond H., Supt. of Schools, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
Soltes, Dr. M., Jewish Welfare Board, 352 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.
Spencer, W. L., Supervisor of Secondary Educ., Montgomery, Ala.
Spozio, Mrs. Evangeline Adams, State Teachers College, Buchanan and Waller, San Francisco, California.
Sprague, H. A., Prin. Montclair State Normal School, Upper Montclair, N. J.
Starch, Daniel, 367 Harvard Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Stark, William E., Superv. Principal of Schools, Stanford, Connecticut.
Steele, Miss Roxana A., Western Normal School, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Stillwell, William Earle, University School, Blair Ave., Avondale, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Stockinger, W. A., Noblesville, Indiana.
Stoddard, A. J., Supt. Dist. No. 3, Town of Eastchester, Bronxville, N. Y.
Stone, C. T., Supt. Schools, Intermediate School Bldg., Long Branch, N. J.
Stone, Cliff W., 603 Linden Avenue, Pullman, Washington.
Stone, Wm. H., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Stoutemyer, J. Howard, 898 East Jefferson St., Franklin, Ind.
Strayer, George D., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Strecker, John K., Librarian Baylor University Library, Waco, Texas.
Stribling, Miss Sallie, High School Bldg., Greenville, S. C.
Strong, B. Norman, Arsenal School, Hartford, Connecticut.
Strong, Edward K., Jr., Box 1675, Stanford University, Cal.
Stuart, Miss Josephine B., 549 County Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts.
Sullivan, Miss Julia E., 9 Marion St., Charlestown, Mass.
Sutherland, Miss Anne, Walnut Hill High School, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Sutherland, Dr. A. H., The Scarborough School, Scarborough-on-Hudson, N. Y.

Suzzallo, Henry, State University, Seattle, Washington.
Swasey, Miss Marion H., 58 Maple St., New Bedford, Mass.
Swenson, Miss Anna, State Dept. of Education, St. Paul, Minn.
Symonds, Percival M., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Tai, S. C., 126 Livingston Hall, Columbia Univ., New York, N. Y.
Tall, Miss Lida Lee, Prin. Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Maryland.
Tallman, R. W., Head Dept. of Educ., Western State Col. of Colorado, Gunnison, Colorado.
Tanger, Landis, Supt. of Schools, Reading, Pennsylvania.
Taylor, Joseph S., District Supt. of Schools, 2275 Loring Place, The Bronx, New York City.
Teach, Charles E., City Hall, Bakersfield, California.
Terman, Lewis M., Dept. of Education, Stanford University, Stanford Univ., California.
Terry, Paul W., Univ. of No. Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Tew, Derwood J., Gen'l Supervisor, Elementary and Junior High Schools, Camden, New Jersey.
Theisen, W. W., Asst. Supt. Bd., School Dir., 10th and Prairie Sts., Milwaukee, Wis.
Thomas, Oscar D., 6160 Webster Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Thompson, Clem O., Ball Teachers' College, Muncie, Ind.
Thompson, Mary A., Elementary School Prin., 1111 McCausland Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
Thomson, John, Westinghouse High School, Murtland & Montecello Streets, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Thorndike, Edward L., Columbia University, New York, New York.
Threlkeld, A. L., Deputy Supt., Administration Bldg., 414-14th St., Denver, Colo.
Thurber, Charles, Editor, Ginn & Co., Boston, Massachusetts.
Tibbets, Miss Anna, Greenville Woman's College, Greenville, S. C.
Tidball, Lewis C., Jr., Commissioner of Education, State Capitol, Cheyenne, Wyo.
Tidwell, R. E., Asst. Supt. Dept. of Education, Montgomery, Ala.
Tidyman, W. F., 1361 College Ave., Fresno, Calif.
Tippett, Jas. S., Lincoln School of Teachers Col., 425 W. 123rd St., New York, N. Y.
Tirapegui, Luis A., Institute Pedagogico, Casilla 604, Santiago, Chile.
Tireman, L. S., Supt. of Schools, Postville, Iowa.
Toaz, Supt. Robert K., Huntington, Long Island, New York.
Toops, Herbert A., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio.
Trabue, M. R., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Tracy, Miss Bettie M., Director of Research, Wheeling, West Virginia.
Traner, F. W., University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada.
Trites, Miss Flora, Dept. of Education, State of Minn., St. Paul, Minn.
Trow, Wm. Clark, Dept. of Educ., Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
Truesdell, Benj. W., 343 N. Market St., Wichita, Kansas.
Trumper, Miss May, Helena, Montana.
Tucker, J. C., Supt. of Schools, Sour Lake, Texas.
Tyson, George R., Dept. of Education, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa.

Uhl, W. L., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.
Updegraff, Dr. Harlan, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa.

Vance, Thomas F., Assoc. Professor of Psychology, Iowa State College, Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Ames, Iowa.
Vandewalker, Miss Nina C., Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.
Van Norman, Miss Mabel, Mary C. Wheeler School, Providence, R. I.

Van Ormer, A. B., Juniata College, Huntington, Pennsylvania.
Van Wagenen, M. J., 1729 Irving Ave., South, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Verplanch, Fred A., South Manchester, Conn.
Viele, Miss Ada B., Sch. of Educ. Univ. N. Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Vincent, H. D., Superv. Prin. Public School No. 16, Troy, N. Y.

Waddell, C. W., 855 N. Vermont Ave., Los Angeles, Cal.
Wager, Ralph E., Emory University, Emory University, Ga.
Wahl, O. E., Supt. of Public Schools, Long Prairie, Minn.
Wahlert, Asst. Supt. H. H., North Bergen, New Jersey.
Wahlert, Miss Jennie, Primary Supervisor, 2918 Harper St., St. Louis, Mo.
Wakeman, Seth, Dept. of Educ., Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Waldo, Dwight B., Pres., Western State Normal School, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Walker, E. T., Intermountain Union College, Helena, Mont.
Walker, Miss M. Eugenia, 749 So. Lincoln St., Denver, Colo.
Wallin, J. E. W., Miami Univ., 206 W. 4th St., Dayton, Ohio.
Walls, W. A., Supt. Schools, Kent, Ohio.
Walsh, M. J., Indiana, Pennsylvania.
Walters, R. J., 2045 So. Clarkson St., Denver, Colorado.
Washburne, Carleton W., Supt. of Schools, Winnetka, Illinois.
Washburne, John N., Lincoln School, Teachers Col., New York, N. Y.
Watkins, Earl P., Weber Ave., Ilion, N. Y.
Watkins, Ralph K., 1329 Ross St., Columbia, Mo.
Watts, Rowland, 3315 Powhatan Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland.
Weathersby, Wm. H., Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss.
Weber, A. W., 2207 East 85th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Weber, S. E., Charleston, West Virginia.
Webster, Geo. W., 30 North Michigan Boul., Chicago, Ill.
Weglein, David E., 2400 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland.
Wells, Guy F., New York Training School, 220 W. 120th Street, New York City, New York.
Wells, S. R., 3521 Grand Blvd., East Chicago, Ind.
Welsh, Wm. Henry, Grant Building, 17th and Pine Streets, Philadelphia, Penn.
Went, Glenn O., Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md.
West, Dr. Henry S., Educational Lecturer, 1768 N. E. 3rd Ave., Miami, Fla.
West, Lee R., Supt. of Schools, Lookeba, Okla.
West, Paul V., School of Educ., N. Y. Univ., 32 Waverley Place, New York, N. Y.
Westbrook, Dr. C. H., Dean, Shanghai College, Shanghai, China.
Wherry, Neal M., Supt. of Schools, Holton, Kansas.
Whipple, Dr. Guy M., 10 Putnam St., Danvers, Mass.
White, Miss Edna N., Director, Merrill-Palmer School, 71 Ferry Ave., East, Detroit, Mich.
Whitney, A. S., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Whitney, Albert W., National Safety Council, 120 West 42nd St., New York, N. Y.
Whitney, Frank P., 2164 Taylor Rd., E. Cleveland, Ohio.
Whitney, Frederick L., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado.
Wickey, Miss Rose, 3031 Paseo, Kansas City, Missouri.
Wilber, Miss Flora, Director Educ. and Mental Meas., Pub. Schools, Ft. Wayne, Ind.
Wilde, Arthur H., 125 Fair Oaks Park, Needham, Massachusetts.
Wildeman, Edward, Prin., James Shields School, 4250 So. Rockwell St., Chicago, Ill.
Wiley, G. N., Asst. Com. of Education, State Education Dept., Albany, N. Y.
Wilkerson, H. Clifton, 106 N. Hickory St., Platteville, Wis.
Willett, G. W., 428 So. Spring Ave., La Grange, Ill.

Williams, E. I. F., 277½ E. Perry St., Tiffin, Ohio.
Williams, Herbert D., Juvenile Adjustment Agency, Toledo Medical Bldg., Toledo, Ohio.
Williams, Dr. J. A., State College, Brookings, So. Dak.
Williams, Lewis W., University High School, Urbana, Ill.
Williams, Sidney J., National Safety Council, 168 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Illinois.
Willing, Matthew H., Lincoln School of Teachers Col., 425 W. 123rd St., New York, N. Y.
Wills, Benj, G., 3014 College Ave., Berkeley, Calif.
Wilson, G. M., Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Wilson, H. B., Supt. of Schools, Berkeley, California.
Wilson, James H., Supt. of Schools, Rocky Ford, Colo.
Wilson, Miss Jessie W., 221 Kenilworth Ave., Dayton, Ohio.
Wilson, Mrs. L. L. W., South High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Winans, B. A., Supt. City Schools, Livingston, Mont.
Winn, J. W., Prin. McKinley School, Fresno County, Fresno, Calif.
Witham, Ernest C., High School Bldg., Wilmington, Del.
Withers, J. W., Dean New York University, 32 Waverley Place, New York, N. Y.
Woelfer, Norman, Wiltondale Road, Towson, Md.
Wolfe, A. A., Supt. of Schools, Greene, Iowa.
Wood, E. R., Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas.
Wood, O. A., 4213 E. 58th St., Kansas City, Missouri.
Wood, Thomas D., 525 W. 120th St., New York, N. Y.
Woods, Roy C., Supt. of Public Schools, Nashua, Iowa.
Woody, Clifford, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Worthington, Edward H., L. B. 80, Wyncote, Pa.
Wotton, Miss Margaret Lee, 815 S. Hill St., Los Angeles, Cal.
Wright, Owen B., 3208-16th Ave., Rock Island, Ill.
Wylie, Dr. Andrew Tennant, 541 West 123rd St., New York, N. Y.

Yates, J. A., Kansas State Teachers Col., Pittsburg, Kansas.
Yoakum, G. A., Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Yocum, A. D., University of Penn., Philadelphia, Pa.
Yonkers, Ralph B., 5017 Griscom St., Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa.
Young, Leonard, Prin. Central High School, Duluth, Minn.
Young, Ross N., Prin. Marshall High School, Minneapolis, Minn.
Youngblood, G. W., High School Bldg., Peru, Ind.

Ziegler, J. W., c/o John C. Winston Co., 1006 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Zinns, Roland W., Prin., George W. Peckham Jr. H. S., 38th and Fond du Lac, Milwaukee, Wis.
Zirbes, Miss Laura, Lincoln School of Teachers College, New York, N. Y.
Zook, D. E., Prin. Nokomis Township High School, Nokomis, Ill.
Zornow, Theo. A., Prin. Madison Jr. High School, Wilson Park, Rochester, N. Y.

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

1. **Purpose.** The purpose of the National Society is to promote the investigation and discussion of educational questions. To this end it holds an annual meeting and publishes a series of Yearbooks.

2. **Eligibility to Membership.** Any person who is interested in receiving its publications may become a member by sending to the Secretary-Treasurer information concerning name, address, and class of membership desired (see Item 4) and a check for $3.00 or $2.50 (see Items 4 and 5). Membership may not be had by libraries or by institutions.

3. **Period of Membership.** Applicants for membership may not date their entrance back of the current calendar year, and all memberships terminate automatically on December 31st, unless the dues for the ensuing year are paid as indicated in Item 6.

4. **Classes of Members.** Application may be made for either active or associate membership. Active members pay two dollars dues annually, receive two copies of each publication, are entitled to vote, to participate in discussion, and (under certain conditions) to hold office. Associate members pay dues of $1.50 annually, receive one copy of each publication, may attend the meetings of the Society, but may not vote, hold office or participate in discussion. The names of active members only are printed in the Yearbook. There were in 1926 about 800 active and 1300 associate members.

5. **Entrance Fee.** New active and new associate members are required the first year to pay, in addition to the dues, an entrance fee of one dollar.

6. **Payment of Dues.** Statements of dues are rendered in October or November for the following calendar year. By vote of the Society at the 1919 meeting, "any member so notified whose dues remain unpaid on January 1st, thereby loses his membership and can be reinstated only by paying the entrance fee of one dollar required of new members." School warrants and vouchers from institutions must be accompanied by definite information concerning the name and address and class of membership of the person for whom membership fee is being paid.

7. **Distribution of Yearbooks to Members.** The Yearbooks, ready prior to each February meeting, will be mailed from the office of the publishers, only to members whose dues for that year have been paid. Members who desire Yearbooks prior to the current year must purchase them directly from the publishers (see Item 8).

8. **Commercial Sales.** The distribution of all Yearbooks prior to the current year, and also of those of the current year not regularly mailed to members in exchange for their dues, is in the hands of the publishers, not of the secretary. For such commercial sales, communicate directly with the Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, who will gladly send a price list covering all the publications of this Society and of its predecessor, the National Herbart Society.

9. **Yearbooks.** The Yearbooks are issued in parts (usually two) from one to four months before the February meeting. They comprise from 450 to 700 pages annually. Unusual effort has been made to make them, on the one hand, of immediate practical value, and on the other hand,

representative of sound scholarship and scientific investigation. Many of them are the fruit of coöperative work by committees of the Society.

10. **Meetings.** The annual meetings, at which the Yearbooks are discussed, are held in February at the same time and place as the meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Applications for membership will be handled promptly at any time on receipt of name and address, together with check for the appropriate amount ($3.00 for new active membership, $2.50 for new associate membership). Generally speaking, applications entitle the new member to the Yearbooks slated for discussion during the calendar year the application is made, but those received in December are regarded as pertaining to the next calendar year.

GUY M. WHIPPLE, Secretary-Treasurer.

10 Putnam Street,
Danvers, Mass.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

140 719

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY